**Rubric for Reflective Writing Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Date Assessed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Physics 199: Scientists at Work STREAMS Summer Bridge**

*This rubric is used to evaluate reflective writing connected with the First Year Seminar, Physics 199: Scientists at Work, taught by Dr. Thomas Kling in association with the STREAMS Summer Bridge for incoming science and math majors. Students write reflectively at various stages in the course about their experiences as a practicing scientist or mathematician.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gross Mistakes**  **(binary)** | The reader did not find gross mistakes that would immediately cast suspicion on the effort / honesty of the document’s creator. | | The reader found gross mistakes that would immediately make an average reader suspicious or feel negative about the reflective writing. |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Fair** |
| **Analysis / Reflection** | The writings offer an in-depth analysis of and reflection on the question(s) they investigate. They waste no time in stating the obvious and are specific and personal: apt evidence is selected, appropriately introduced and fully analyzed. | The writings offer a good analysis of and reflection on the question(s) they investigate. They offer a unique perspective: good evidence is selected, appropriately introduced, and well analyzed. | The writings offer considerable analysis and reflection. Evidence is not always fully analyzed and the argument is often rather general. |
| **Argument** | The writings provide a surprisingly strong, coherent, and compelling argument with a clear point and sound logic, and they offer vivid detail and highly specific examples. The writings make an insightful argument with force and clarity. | The writings present a strong argument supported by good evidence. They offer sufficient detail and use examples to illustrate a point. | The argument is solid but general. At times, the writing lacks specific evidence, examples and detail. |
| **Investment** | It is obvious that the argument matters to the writer. The writer clearly explains the connection between her personal thinking and scholarly pursuits. | The argument is convincing. The writer articulates the connection between her personal thinking and scholarly pursuits. | Overall, the argument is convincing, but lacks at times a clear articulation between her personal thinking and scholarly pursuits. |
| **Awareness** | The writings exhibit a keen self-awareness and consistently avoid broad generalizations of individual experiences. | The writings exhibit self-awareness and mostly avoid broad generalizations of individual experiences. | The writings exhibit some self-awareness and rarely generalize. |
| **Sentence style:**  **Flow of writing** | The reader thinks the clear, concise writings are enjoyable to read. The writer uses a lot of sentence variety and strong word choices. | The reader thinks the writings are good, but perhaps the writer could have introduced a little more variety and/or written in a more concise fashion. | The reader thinks some of the writing is awkward and/or the writer relies too heavily on the same kind of sentence structure. |
| **Correctness: Grammar and writing mechanics** | This reader noticed few errors, if any. The writings are clear, and the writer shows considerable mastery of the language. | This reader noticed some grammatical / mechanical errors, but these errors did not interfere with the reader’s understanding of the writer. | This reader noticed numerous grammatical / mechanical errors, and those errors interfered at times with the reader’s understanding of the writer. |