Mechanical TA:
Partially Automated High-Stakes Peer Grading

Online Appendix

November 24, 2014

CPSC 430 2014 grading rubric

For each of the following four dimensions, choose the option that best describes the essay:

Argument structure

Was the essay WELL STRUCTURED, stating a thesis, supporting it with argument(s) that are clearly related to this point and (if relevant) distinct from one another, and linking these arguments in a logical way?

0. It is unclear what this essay is arguing.

1. It is apparent what is being argued, but much of the reasoning is unsound, unclear, or unrelated.

2. The thesis is clearly stated, and some claims support the thesis, but others are irrelevant and/or redundant.

3. All claims lend support to a clearly stated thesis, but they are insufficiently distinct and/or poorly linked together.

4. All claims lend support to a clearly stated thesis, which in turn relates appropriately to the question asked. The claims are distinct from one another and build well on each other in a logical progression.

5. Very well structured: the thesis is clear and well related to the question asked; the logical structure of arguments does an excellent job of supporting this thesis.

Case

Did the essay do a GOOD JOB OF MAKING ITS CASE, choosing relevant arguments, backing them up with evidence and examples at an appropriate level of detail, and responding to contrary views as appropriate?

0. Claims are asserted with no further support, or not asserted at all.

1. The essay stated many facts about the topic in question, but there is not a clear separation between argument and evidence.

2. The essay makes recognizable arguments and backs them up with evidence, but relevance and/or level of detail are very inappropriate and/or extremely relevant contrary views are disregarded.

3. Arguments are clearly stated and generally support the thesis; these arguments are backed up with generally relevant evidence at a broadly appropriate level of detail. No extremely relevant contrary view undermines these arguments, though such arguments may or may not be explicitly addressed in the essay.

4. All claims are grounded in relevant and specific arguments at an appropriate level of detail; some attempt is made to respond to alternate points of view.

5. Whether or not I personally agree with the essay's thesis, it makes a compelling argument for its point of view. Arguments are very relevant, backed up with evidence at an appropriate level of detail, and (within space available) responses are offered to obvious objections.

Subject matter

Did the essay demonstrate a good UNDERSTANDING OF THE COURSE'S SUBJECT MATTER, including both the topic and the wider context?

0. Profound and fundamental misunderstanding of the subject matter.

1. Poor understanding of the subject matter; major errors.

2. Factual errors that substantially undermined the essay's main point.

3. Generally correct understanding, but minor errors and/or errors of omission (failure to introduce important facts).

4. Correct understanding, generally balanced presentation at an appropriate level of detail.

5. Insightful understanding, creative and balanced use of the course's subject matter.

English

Was the essay presented CLEARLY AND IN CORRECT ENGLISH?

0. Completely indecipherable.

1. Very difficult to understand.

2. Weak presentation; errors that impede understanding.

3. Mostly correct, fairly clear writing.

4. Clear and correct writing.

5. Very clear and correct writing.