From: Maralee Harrell "Grading According to a Rubric." Teaching Philosophy. 28.1 (2005): 3-14, pages 7-8. See the article itself for full the discussion and the entire rubric (this is only a portion).

Table 1

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
CONTENT	85 (total)			
Argument				
Thesis	5	4	3	0
Premises	15	12	9	0
Support	15	12	9	0
Counter-Arguments	10	8	6	0
Understanding				
Text	5	4	3	0
Ideas	5	4	3	0
Analysis	10	8	6	0
Synthesis	10	8	6	0
Creation				
Examples	5	4	3	0
Alternative Positions	5	4	3	0
STYLE	15 (total)			
Clarity	6	5	4	0
Organization				
Introduction	3	2	1	0
Body	3	2	1	0
Conclusion	3	2	1	0

[What follows is the material for the thesis and premises. See the full article for discussion of the other elements of the rubric.

Appendix

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
CONTENT				
Argument				

Thesis	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.	The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.	There is no thesis.
Premises	Each reason for believing the thesis is made clear, and, as much as possible, presented in single statements. It is also clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear, and made in single statements. The premises that are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement. It is also pretty clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear. The premises that are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	The premises must be reconstructed from the text of the paper. It is not made clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. There are no sub-arguments, or, if there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are not made clear. The paper does not provide sub-arguments for controversial premises. The plausibility of the premises that are taken as given is questionable.	There are no premises—the paper merely restates the thesis. Or, if there are premises, they are much more likely to be false than true.