CONFLICT DISPUTE & RESOLUTION

Reflection Paper #1: Rubric Explanation

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Mediocre	Unacceptable
General Requirements Expected Throughout				
Technical Requirements	The summary follows all the "General Technical Requirements" (on page 6 of the syllabus and posted on the course website).	The summary generally follows those technical requirements.	The summary does not follow some of the more important technical requirements.	The summary suggests a complete lack of awareness concerning the technical requirements for this assignment.
Clarity	The paper follows the conventions of standard written English, with no errors hindering comprehension. All words are chosen for their precise meanings.	The paper generally follows the conventions of standard written English, with errors not hindering comprehension. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings.	The paper generally follows the conventions of standard written English, with errors hindering comprehension. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings.	The paper does not follow the conventions of standard written English, with major errors. The paper does not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings.
Context	All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Any necessary background information (key concepts, theories, etc.) is accurately and completely explained.	Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Any necessary background information (key concepts, theories, etc.) is explained.	New or unusual terms are not well-defined. Necessary background information (key concepts, theories, etc.) is not explained.	New or unusual terms make no sense or are used incorrectly. Necessary background information (key concepts, theories, etc.) makes no sense or is used inaccurately.
Competency	The paper displays competency and understanding of the course material.	The paper displays reasonable competency and understanding of that material.	The paper does not display an adequate understanding of the material.	The paper displays serious misunderstandings about the material.
Reflection	The paper displays an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the course material and meaningfully connects that material to the author's own life and experiences.	The paper displays a general reflection on, and personalization of, course material, and makes some good connections between that material and the author's own life and experiences.	The paper displays a minimal reflection on, and personalization of, the course material, making few connections between that material and the author's own life and experiences.	The paper displays a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the course material, and makes no real connections between that material and the author's own life and experiences.
Academic Integrity*	The paper properly cites and/or acknowledges all outside sources using APA formatting. As relevant, the paper includes "References" and "Acknowledgments" sections at the end.	The paper cites and/or acknowledges outside sources, but with sloppy or inconsistent formatting.	The paper displays a minimal effort to cite and/or acknowledge outside sources, but without any clear formatting.	The paper commits plagiarism or suffers from another academic integrity violation.

*Depending on the severity of the circumstances, a mark of mediocre or unacceptable for academic integrity may also result in the instructor writing letters to the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and the Coordinator of Community Standards informing them of an academic integrity violation in this course.

Please continue ►

Reflection Paper #1: Rubric Explanation (Continued)

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Mediocre	Unacceptable
Introduction: Background & Thesis Statement				
Organization	The thesis statement (the answer to the central question, "To what extent is your current approach to conflict prudent?") is clear, and presented in the introduction.	The thesis statement is presented in the introduction.	The thesis statement is not contained in the introduction.	Only the topic is introduced, with no description of the paper's argument. Or, the argument is described inaccurately.
	The paper and its topic is introduced with minimal fanfare in four or five sentences.	The paper and its topic is introduced with little fanfare in four or five sentences.	The paper and its topic is introduced with too much fanfare, in more than five sentences.	
	It is made clear how the paper will justify its thesis statement, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a concise summary of the steps in argument.	It is generally clear how the paper will justify its thesis statement, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a description of the steps in argument.	The flow of the paper is described as an outline, and not as a description of the steps in argument.	
Thesis Statement	The paper's introductory paragraph has a clear answer to the central question, "To what extent is your current approach to conflict prudent?"	The paper's answer to the central question is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it in the introductory paragraph.	The paper's answer to the central question is present, but it must be uncovered or reconstructed from what is actually written in the paper.	No clear answer to the central question is stated.
Body: Justification of the Thesis Statement				
Organization	It is very easy to follow the argument.	It is generally easy to follow the argument.	It is somewhat difficult to follow the argument.	It is impossible to follow the argument.
	It is made explicit which claims are being used as premises (assumptions, reasons, evidence, etc.), and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis statement.	It is clear which claims are being used as premises, and how these premises are supposed to support the thesis statement.	It is somewhat unclear which claims are being used as premises, and/or how these premises are supposed to support the thesis statement.	It is completely unclear which claims are being used as premises. It is completely unclear how the premises are supposed to support the thesis statement.
	New premises are each distinguished and introduced separately.	Usually, new premises are distinguished and introduced separately.	Separate premises are lumped together without being clearly distinguished.	Premises are presented and discussed randomly, or not at all.
Premises	Each premise (assumption, reason, evidence, etc.) justifying the thesis statement is made clear, and, as much as possible, presented in single statements.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement.	The premises must be reconstructed from what is actually written in the paper.	There are no premises—the paper merely restates and repeats the thesis statement without justification.

Please continue ▶

Reflection Paper #1: Rubric Explanation (Continued)

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Mediocre	Unacceptable
Body: Justification of the Thesis Statement (Continued)				
Plausibility	The paper is clear about which premises (assumptions, reasons, evidence, etc.) are controversial and which are not.	The paper is pretty clear about which premises are controversial and which are not.	The paper is not clear about which premises are controversial and which are not.	The paper makes claims that are much more likely to be false than true. Important claims seem to be fabricated or entirely made up.
	Persuasive justification is provided for all controversial premises.	Persuasive justification is provided for most controversial premises.	Persuasive justification is not provided for the controversial premises.	
	Premises without justification are logical, reasonable, and seem true.	Premises without justification are at least plausibly true.	The plausibility of the premises that are taken as given is questionable.	
	All information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate.	Most information is accurate with only minor errors.	Some information contains obvious errors and/or inaccuracies.	Most information is incorrect or mistaken.
Support	The premises (assumptions, reasons, evidence, etc.) clearly support the thesis statement, and the author is clearly aware of exactly the kind of support those premises provide.	The premises support the thesis statement, and the author is aware of the general kind of support those premises provide.	The premises somewhat support the thesis statement, but the author does not seem aware of the kind of support those premises actually provide.	The premises do not support the thesis statement.
	Support of the thesis statement also comes from carefully answering this assignment's four supporting questions.	The four supporting questions are generally answered, though not very well.	The four supporting questions are barely addressed in the paper.	The four supporting questions are not addressed at all in the paper.
Examples	Good, clear examples from the author's life and experiences are used to illustrate concepts and issues. They are relevant, insightful, and well-used.	Examples are clear, relevant, and well-used.	Examples are not clear, only somewhat relevant, and/or not well-used.	Examples are unclear, missing, irrelevant, and/or misused.
Relevance	The relevance of each part of the paper for defending the thesis statement is clear and insightful.	The relevance of each part of the paper for defending the thesis statement is generally clear, though some inessential details appear.	The relevance of each part of the paper for defending the thesis statement is somewhat unclear, and inessential details repeatedly appear.	Significant parts of the paper are not relevant for defending the thesis statement, and there are too many inessential details.
Overall Synthesis	Overall, the paper successfully integrates all its parts into a coherent and compelling argument in defense of the thesis statement.	Overall, the paper integrates most of its parts into a fairly coherent and compelling argument in defense of the thesis statement.	Overall, the paper integrates some of its parts into a somewhat coherent and compelling argument in defense of the thesis statement.	Overall, the paper fails to come together as a coherent and compelling argument in defense of the thesis statement.

Please continue ▶

Reflection Paper #1: Rubric Explanation (Continued)

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Mediocre	Unacceptable
Conclusion: One *Practical* Implication of the Thesis				
Questioning	There is no summarization of the paper's argument or contents. One clear and concrete practical implication of accepting the paper's thesis is proposed. This is one concrete recommendation, based on the paper's thesis statement, for how the author can start to respond to conflict more effectively and prudently. ("Practical" means that this is about the author's actual behavior and actions. "Concrete" means that the recommendation is as specific as possible about what exactly the author should start doing differently.)	There is no summarization of the paper's argument or contents. One fairly clear practical implication of accepting the paper's thesis is proposed. This recommendation for the author makes sense and follows from the thesis, though it is not very specific.	There is some unnecessary summarization of the paper's argument or contents. A practical implication of accepting the paper's thesis is not made entirely clear. There is no obvious recommendation for the author, or the reader must work to figure it out.	The conclusion needlessly summarizes the contents of the paper. No practical implication of accepting the paper's thesis statement is given. There is no recommendation at all.