

**Rhetoric & Composition Doctoral Student Learning Outcomes Rubrics:
Outcomes 1.1 – 1.4 and 3.2, and 3.4**

Outcome 1.1 -- Graduates can demonstrate and articulate familiarity with rhetorical theories and histories from the classical period to the present. Artifact = comp question 1.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Addresses the question, discusses theories from historical and contemporary figures with satisfying depth, choosing and using appropriate quotes, evidence, and original insight in a sophisticated manner with no factual errors	Addresses the question, discusses theories from historical and contemporary figures, choosing and using appropriate quotes and evidence perhaps in a straightforward manner with no factual errors	May depart from the question, may not discuss theories from historical and contemporary figure in sufficient depth; may not use enough compelling evidence to support points; may have factual errors
Makes surprising or fresh connections among the insights of historical and contemporary figures	Makes solid and relevant connections among the insights of historical and contemporary figures	Connections across historical and contemporary times may be thin, forced, unconvincing, or absent

Outcome 1.2 -- Graduates can demonstrate and articulate familiarity with the histories and major theories of composition studies from the 20th century to the present.

Artifact = comp question 2.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Addresses the question, discusses major histories and theories from the 20 th century through the present choosing and using appropriate quotes, evidence, and original insight in a sophisticated manner with no factual errors	Addresses the question, discusses major histories and theories from the 20 th century through the present choosing and using appropriate quotes and evidence perhaps in a straightforward manner with no factual errors	May depart from the question, may not discuss major histories and theories from the 20 th century to the present in sufficient depth; may not use enough compelling evidence to support points; may have factual errors
Makes surprising or fresh connections among the insights of figures throughout the 20 th and 21 st century	Makes solid and relevant connections among the insights of figures throughout the 20 th and 21 st century	Connections across histories and theories may be thin, forced, unconvincing, or absent

Outcome 3.4 -- Graduates can produce effective and cohesive texts within controlled timeframes. Artifact = any of the 24-hour comp questions.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Responds with satisfying depth; clearly signals main and sub-points; offers compelling evidence; may contain mechanical and/or grammatical errors, but none interfering with meaning; may extend existing work with fresh insights and a new argument	Responds with sufficient depth; clearly signals main points, offers appropriate and sufficient evidence, will likely contain mechanical and/or grammatical errors, but none that seriously interfere with meaning	Responses are thin, offering little evidence; main ideas may jump around without transition; errors may interfere with meaning

**Rhetoric & Composition Doctoral Student Learning Outcomes Rubrics:
Outcomes 1.1 – 1.4 and 3.2, and 3.4**

Outcome 1.3 -- Graduates are able to sustain a scholarly discussion in at least one secondary area beyond the primary area of the dissertation. Artifact = comp question 3 and sometimes 4.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Identifies, presents and synthesizes existing scholarship in the area, accurately reporting different scholarly stances and arguments; evaluates, critiques and extends those scholarly positions, substantively moving the conversation forward with original contribution	Identifies, presents and synthesizes existing scholarship in the area, accurately reporting different scholarly stances and arguments	Does not sufficiently engage in existing scholarship; offers inaccurate or insufficient characterizations of different scholarly stances and arguments; may not be positioned in an existing conversation

Outcome 1.4 -- Graduates can define key terms in the field using existing scholarship. Artifact = comp question 3 and sometimes 4.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Key term is defined in a complex and robust scholarly discussion using appropriate work from the relevant scholars	Key term is defined in a straightforward way using appropriate work from the relevant scholars	No definition is offered, or no scholar is cited, or the definition is not clearly derived from appropriate scholarship

Outcome 3.2 -- Graduates can demonstrate the ability to work within the conventions of scholarly articles in the field. Artifact = submittable article.

<i>3 = Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>2 = Meets Expectations</i>	<i>1 = Below Expectations</i>
Article appears to have been written appropriately for the conventions of the chosen professional venue in our field, appropriately building on an existing conversation in that venue and extending it with new insights	Article appears to have been written appropriately for the conventions of the chosen venue in our field, including situating itself in a conversation appropriate to that venue	Article does not appear to have been written appropriately for the conventions of the chosen venue; may lack sufficient citations, including those from the venue itself; venue does not seem connected to our field in a meaningful way

[note: "articles" could be traditional journal articles, chapters in edited collections, digital texts appropriate to the forum, or other publishable texts appropriate for actual outlets]