**Rubric: Critical Campus Map**

The goals of the Critical Campus map come from the course learning outcomes, which state that students should know how to:

- think critically about and express their thoughts on ability as an identity marker through spoken discussions, analytical argument, and scholarly research

- recognize and interpret tropes of illness and disability in a wide range of cultural products

- interact more easily with people whose way of perceiving and experiencing the world may differ from theirs

- craft and present an academic argument in written, cartographic, and videographic form

In working toward those outcomes, students will receive a grade on their map based on the rubric below.

**STRUCTURE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20-18 | 17.5 | 17 | 16.5-16 | 15-14 | 13-0 |
| The texts for the individual locations first orient the reader within the larger project and then lead the reader progressively deeper into the analysis of that location. | The texts for the individual locations simply establish the topic and then add additional information about that location with each subsequent sentence. Generally do not move consistently toward more complex material, and do not orient the reader. | The texts for the individual locations are clearly related to each location, but information is presented in a sequence that is sometimes disorienting, both for that location and the larger project. Rarely move toward more complex material. | The texts for the individual locations are clearly related to each location, but information is presented in a way that is either consistently confusing (requires second readings) or overly simplistic and repetitive. | The texts for the individual locations seem to be randomly-ordered collections of sentences. | Does not address the assignment, plagiarizes (0), or does not meet standards for academic writing or argumentation |
| The Story Map as a whole is written and arranged in such a way that the foundations of the argument are established early on and each location pushes the argument toward a more complex conclusion. | The Story Map as a whole is written and arranged in such a way that the argument follows a clear logical arc as it progresses, but it does not increase in complexity. | The Story Map as a whole is written and arranged in a way that is confusing in context of the argument’s logic. | The Story Map as a whole is written and arranged in a way that is either consistently confusing or overly simplistic and repetitive. | The Story Map as a whole completely lacks clear organization. |
| Meets all requirements as listed in the assignment description: number and type of sections, word counts, and images. | | Meets the majority of requirements. | | Meets less than half of requirements. |

**ARGUMENT, EVIDENCE, & ANALYSIS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 30-27 | 26.5-26 | 25.5-25 | 24.5-24 | 23.5-21 | 20.5-0 |
| The major claim is clearly stated, but complex, insightful, and unexpected. The thesis responds to a true question, tension or problem. Evolves throughout the Story Map to become more complex. | Either the major claim is clear, arguable, and complex but misses opportunities for nuance or subtlety, or else it set out to explore an ambitious idea whose complexity leads to minor errors in articulation. Evolves, but does so either sporadically or unconvincingly. | Either the major claim is clear and arguable but lacks complexity or else sets out to explore an intriguing idea that has not developed into a specific claim. | The major claim is logical and would require some evidence to prove, but the stakes are not as high as they should be. The Story Map’s major claims are somewhat unclear, unspecific or uninteresting. | The major claim of the Story Map is faulty, i.e., vague, simple, or obvious. The Story Map does not respond to a true question, tension, or problem. |  |
| The best available evidence is introduced not only to support but also to challenge and complicate the claims and stakes of the Story Map. It is often drawn from unexpected places, and its nuances are insightfully explored. | All ideas are supported with well-chosen evidence, and the analysis demonstrates several moments of keen insight, but also includes arguments that lack subtlety or are insufficiently explained elsewhere in the Story Map. | Most ideas are supported with well-chosen evidence that is sometimes explored in an insightful way, although nuances are often neglected. | The Story Map makes some effort to explore the subtleties of the evidence and may be occasionally insightful, but it rarely uses evidence to complicate the argument and develop new claims. | Examples offered as evidence may be insufficient or irrelevant. Instead of being used to develop the argument, evidence remains undigested and unexplored. | Does not address the assignment, plagiarizes (0), or does not meet standards for academic writing or argumentation. |
| The evidence for the heart of the argument is drawn from experiential knowledge; evidence from a range of readings is incorporated in a way that furthers and/or refines the author’s argument. Contradictory evidence is acknowledged and addressed convincingly. | The evidence for the heart of the argument is drawn from experiential knowledge; quality evidence from a range of readings is offered and generally serves to further and/or refine the author’s argument, but may simply restate portions of it. Contradictory evidence may be acknowledged, but is not addressed convincingly. | Offers evidence from both experiential knowledge and readings in appropriate ratio, but allows evidence from readings (or one in particular) to drive the argument, rather than using it to support the author’s original interpretation of the locations. Contradictory evidence may be acknowledged, but is not addressed convincingly. | Does offer evidence from both experiential knowledge and readings, but the relationship between the two types of evidence is unclear or there is an excessive reliance on one type or limited sources. Any evidence from readings seems to be included simply because it is required, not because it serves a purpose for the argument. | If it offers evidence at all, then: almost entirely evidence of one type or the other; or offers both, but has an excessive reliance on limited readings. |
| Evidence from readings is always incorporated in a way that shows a nuanced grasp of the ideas in all of the cited texts and larger course themes. | Evidence from readings is mostly incorporated in a way that shows a nuanced grasp of either the ideas in most of the texts or larger course themes; or a solid, perhaps limited understanding of both. | Evidence from readings is mostly incorporated in a way that shows a solid, perhaps limited understanding of either the ideas in most of the texts or larger course themes. | Evidence from readings is mostly incorporated in a way that shows a very limited understanding of the ideas in the texts or larger course themes. | Evidence from readings is mostly incorporated in a way that shows misunderstanding of either the ideas in the texts or larger course themes. |

**SOURCES AND FORMATTING**

***Minimum requirements for Works Cited:*** at least 3 *cited* course readings total; one must be Siebers, one must be Hamraie

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15-14 | 13.5 | 13 | 12.5-12 | 11-10.5 | 10-0 |
| List of cited sources goes beyond minimum requirements. | | List of cited sources meets minimum requirements. | | List of cited sources does not meet minimum requirements | Does not address the assignment, plagiarizes (0), or does not meet standards for academic writing or argumentation |
| Chicago format (Notes-Bibliography, footnotes version) used correctly and consistently throughout the entire Story Map. | Chicago format (Notes-Bibliography, footnotes version) used correctly throughout most of the Story Map. | Chicago format (Notes-Bibliography, footnotes version) attempted throughout the Story Map, but with consistent mistakes. | Chicago format (Notes-Bibliography, footnotes version) may appear occasionally, but Story Map mainly uses another system or combination of others. | Citations and works cited list do not resemble any kind of recognized citational style. |

**GRAMMAR & STYLE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15-14 | 13.5 | 13 | 12.5-12 | 11-10.5 | 10-0 |
| The writing is clear and concise, yet mechanically and stylistically sophisticated, demonstrating sentence variety and appropriate vocabulary. | The writing is mostly clear but may have isolated moments of confusion due to mechanical and/or stylistic problems. | The writing is mostly clear, but it contains occasional moments of confusion due to mechanical and/or stylistic problems. | The writing is somewhat clear, but it contains frequent moments of confusion due to mechanical and/or stylistic problems. | The writing is confusing throughout entire map because it exhibits numerous mechanical and/or stylistic problems. | Does not address the assignment, plagiarizes (0), or does not meet standards for academic writing or argumentation |
| The author’s engagement with the topic is obvious in their tone, so the map is a true pleasure to read. | The author’s engagement with the topic is often visible in their tone, making the map enjoyable to read. | The author’s engagement with the topic is visible in their tone at times, making the map somewhat enjoyable to read. | The author’s tone suggests disinterest in the topic, making the map very dry. | The author’s tone is entirely absent, making the map difficult to read. |

**PRESENTATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20-18 | 17.5 | 17 | 16.5-16 | 15-14 | 13-0 |
| Student is well-prepared to present the highlights of their Story Map in an easily comprehensible and engaging manner without reading from the screen. Speaks 2.5-3 min. | Student is prepared to present the highlights of their Story Map in an easily comprehensible manner without reading from the screen. Speaks for +/- 30 sec over/under. | Student is somewhat prepared to present their Story Map without reading from the screen, but presentation is not easily comprehensible because of organizational flaws or general lack of preparation. Speaks for +/- 45 sec over/under. | Student is not very prepared to present their Story Map – relies excessively on reading from the screen and/or presentation is difficult to follow. Speaks for ≤ 1.5 min or is cut off at 4. | Student does not seem to be prepared for the presentation at all due to excessive reading from the screen and lack of organization. Speaks for ≤ 1 min or is cut off at 4. | Does not address the assignment, plagiarizes (0), or does not meet standards for academic writing or argumentation |
| Self-motivated to engage in extended, highly productive dialogue regarding commonalities and differences in the Story Maps. | | Self-motivated simply to report their ideas or ask straightforward questions regarding commonalities and differences in the Story Maps. | | Talks to others about the Story Maps, but only when prompted. |

**Total grade: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/100**