**Dialectical Journal Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Critical Reader** **5** | **Connected Reader** **4** | **Thoughtful Reader****3** | **Literal Reader****2** | **Developing Reader****1** |  |
| ***POINTS:***  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Quotations &****Critical****Thinking****(overview)** | Detailed, meaningful; uses academic language to explain the quotation in terms of a universal significance, asaspect of self or life | Less detailed, but still meaningful.Explains the quotation inthe text and shows someability to make meaningfrom what you read. | Few good details. Trouble including ideas about the quotation in context | Poor, if any details.Rarely includes ideasabout the quotation in the written response. | Includes few ideasother than summary or superficialinterpretation. |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Literary / Rhetorical****Elements &****Style****(Observations)** | Identifies several rhetorical/style elements, connects them to the insights in an academically insightful, interesting way | Identifies some rhetorical / style elements and analyzes them in some depth in the insights | Lists required elements, but incudes little discussion of their meaning in the text | Few elements,almost no discussionof meaning.Disregards author’sstyle as means tofurther meaning. | Regards author’s style as impediment to furtherunderstanding. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Interpretation****(Insights)** | Uses academic language to discuss ideas in depth; avoids clichés; analyzes the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;Makes high-level connections to self, text, and world;considers differentpossible interpretations or perspectives from the selection. | Uses academic language to discuss ideas in some depth; analyzes the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;Makes some connections to self, text, or world; | Uses vague language to discuss ideas in some depth; lacks analysis of the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;Makes few connections to self, text, or world;Simple, superficialinterpretation of the text. | Unable to understandmeaning of story;summarizes, and doesn’t reachobvious connectionsto the text | Makes few/noconnections, nodevelopment |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **Questions and****Connections****(CQs)** | Uses academic language to produce Insightful, text-text, text-self, text-world connections, thought- provoking Level-2 or -3 question that prompts high-level response; | Uses academic language to produce personal connections, thought- provoking Level 2 or 3 question that prompts academic response; | Few to some general connections,Level 1 or low-level 2 (obvious to simple) question about the text. | Obvious question, few to no connections.Sometimes confusedby unclear or difficult sections of the text. | No attempt to question or make connections |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Coverage of****Text:****Analysis** | Covers text thoroughly.Uses academic language to “read” between thelines” to carry on an on-going dialogue with thetext: question, agree,disagree, appreciate, object | Covers important parts;Constructs a thoughtful,believable interpretation of the text. Explain why youagree or disagree with textby providing support. | Covers most parts, butomits details necessary tomake connections to yourown past experiences,feelings, or knowledge. | Minimal coverage.You accept the textliterally withoutthinking of differentpossibilities inmeaning. | Little if any coverage.Text is confusing, and little effort is shown in trying to figure it out. |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |
| **Presentation** | Neat, organized, looksprofessional; clearly legible and marked; follows or goes beyond the scope of the assignment | Neat and readable; Follows most directions of the assignment; | Somewhat difficult to read,follows some directions | Difficult to read,doesn’t followdirections | Illegible; doesn’tfollow directions |
| **TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 50**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

REFLECTIONS / COMMENTS: