

Formative Rubric:

					For further development and improvement
Criticality	Managed to a high standard	Managed well	Managed at a basic level	Not managed this	https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/criticalwriting Use the 'so what' question. When writing regularly ask yourself "So what?" - if you can ask this, then it's an indication of descriptive work rather than critical analysis and critique Watch the Skills Team videos on the canvas site
Critique	High-level of critique that is justified with references and clearly explained. Clear rationale.	Good critique that is justified with references and clearly explained.	Unsubstantiated, shows bias fails to incorporate the bigger picture and the wider perspective	Weak – considerable room for improvement	Use the 'so what' question. When writing regularly ask yourself "So what?" - if you can ask this, then it's an indication of descriptive work rather than critical analysis and critique Remember critique has two key aspects: analytical critique (your critical analysis of the paper) and methodological (your critique of the paper's methodological approach). Consider using the Bassey questions to help provide a framework/clear structure for your work: · What is the main contribution to knowledge that the paper is claiming? · What conceptual frameworks / theories are being quoted? · What wider body of knowledge is the author drawing on? · What is the core methodology that underpins the research? · How was the data collected? · How was the data analysed? · Does the evidence / argument presented substantiate the claims being made? · Does the author have a biased / prejudiced position?

Structure	Excellent	Effective	Good	Poor/weak considerable room for improvement	Structure – clear introduction, clear conclusion, logically structured and justified argument. Bias? Consider reading more – look at academic papers, the exemplars from previous students to see if you can identify how they have structured their work. Also see the support materials at https://www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/study-at-hull/library/skills
Narrative 'flow' or coherent argument	Excellent	Effective	Good	Poor/weak	Proofread carefully before submission – for clarity and flow Think about 'flow' – how one para links with and leads into the next. Linking sentences. Think about whether your argument/position is consistent throughout your work
Written English	Excellent	Good	Average Acceptable	Poor	https://www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/study-at-hull/library/skill Check that you are using English spellchecker, not American. You may need to write more formally. Avoid abbreviations and colloquial language. Does it make sense? Is it clear? Is the terminology suitable 'academic'?
Referencing accuracy	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Use of direct quotes – aim to use only when you wish to make a strong point, it's usually always better to paraphrase, or, make sure the quote is seamlessly integrated into your work – flow. https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/referencing
Reference source validity	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor/weak	Use sources from academic peer reviewed journals and books. Avoid websites unless .gov
No of references	High	Acceptable	Low	Very low or missing entirely	Read up on what are a 'suitable' number of references

Relevancy of references	All are directly relevant	Majority are directly relevant	Some are relevant, many are only tangentially relevant	Few are that relevant. May not be relevant at all	References must back up your argument. Use references from key authors and valid academic sources.
References – is it clear you have actually read them	Clear evidence shown though how the author's work is incorporated into your argument	Some evidence shown though how the author's work is incorporated into your argument, though this does not apply to all references	Some evidence, yet majority do not really evidence your understanding of the author's work	Little to no evidence that you have read them. References seem 'stuck in' without evidence of understanding the author's work	References used need to have been read by you. Your work needs to evidence your understanding of the author's key argument[s], stance, position, contribution.

Summative Rubric:

Criteria	Ratings					Points	Available
Critique An analysis of a scholarly article. A structured fair and justified-by-evidence explanation/ examination of its strengths and weaknesses. Situating the piece within the wider academic field. Criticality Analytical Criticality - situating your ideas and the ideas of others within the wider body of literature to indicate whether their ideas are more mainstream or more fringe within the field in which they are discussing. A key aspect of criticality is situating your own exploration of the paper / author within the wider field to which it / they apply. Methodological criticality is the use of evidence to support ideas/argument, how the evidence has been gathered and presented and whether the evidence substantiates any claims made	10 Pts A excellent critique Very well justified with references and very clearly explained.	9 Pts A good critique justified with references and reasonably clearly explained.	8 Pts A reasonable critique May have some good points, yet overall they are not really coherently presented.	7 Pts A weak critique This may be: unsubstantiated, shows bias, fails to incorporate the bigger picture and the wider perspective. It may have a somewhat jumbled approach to critiquing the paper, selectively picking and choosing certain aspects, without a clear framework for your discussion. There may be material that is not really relevant	6 Pts No clear critique There is no evidence of critique	0 Pts Sources of further support and development https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ioe-writing-centre/critical-reading-and-writing/critical-review https://libguides.reading.ac.uk/masters/writing Use the 'so what' question. When writing regularly ask yourself "So what?" - if you can ask this, then it's an indication of descriptive work rather than critical analysis and critique Sources of further support and development https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/criticalwriting https://canvas.hull.ac.uk/courses/64311/pages/being-critical https://cdn.southampton.ac.uk/assets/imported/transforms/content-block/UsefulDownloads_Download/8F0C97287F844BF5A87A3C12DCD4E15E/Critical%20review.pdf	
Structure and narrative flow Flow in writing usually refers to how easily a reader can get into the text. That is to say, how easily the reader moves past	10 Pts Excellent	9 Pts Good	8 Pts Reasonable	7 Pts weak	0 Pts Sources of further support and development https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/g/graduate_writing/documents/F/low-Handout.pdf Proofread		

the text and into a reading experience where she or he is connecting with the ideas presented within the text. Flow is a word used to describe writing that has logical structure and varied language within and between sentences and paragraphs					carefully before submission – for clarity and flow Think about ‘flow’ – how one para links with and leads into the next. It’s really important. Aim for clarity. https://www.grammarflip.com/blog/the-four-levels-of-flow-in-writing-what-it-means-when-writing-flows Bassey questions to help provide a framework/clear structure for your work: • What is the main contribution to knowledge that the paper is claiming? • What conceptual frameworks / theories are being quoted? • What wider body of knowledge is the author drawing on? • What is the core methodology that underpins the research? • How was the data collected? • How was the data analysed? • Does the evidence / argument presented substantiate the claims being made? • Does the author have a biased / prejudiced position		
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Written English Quality of written English	10 Pts Excellent	9 Pts Good	8 Pts Reasonable room for improvement	7 Pts considerable room for improvement	0 Pts Sources of further support and development Sources of further support and development https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/writing https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/grammar https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/criticalwriting		
Referencing Technical accuracy How accurate your reference list and in text referencing is	10 Pts Excellent	9 Pts Good	8 Pts Reasonable - room for improvement	7 Pts considerable Room for improvement	0 Pts Sources of further support and development https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/referencing/home https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/referencing/guidelines Use of direct quotes – aim to use only when you wish to make a strong point, it's usually always better to paraphrase, or, make sure the quote is seamlessly integrated into your work – flow		
Referencing Reference Sources How academically suitable/valid your reference sources are.	11 Pts Excellent	10 Pts Good	9 Pts Reasonable room for improvement	0 Pts considerable Room for improvement	See Skills Team materials		
Referencing - number of references and Relevancy of references, Whether you have provided a suitable number of references, generally more references can be found in the best work. yet references need to be relevant to the discussion	9 Pts High	8 Pts Acceptable	7 Pts Low		See Skills Team Materials		

Overall Grading range	
60 - 51	Very Good
50 - 41	Good
40 – 31	Adequate
30 - 0	Weak