

## Student–Led Seminar Evaluation Rubric

| Category                                  | F (Fail)                                                                              | D (Below Average Work)                                                                                                 | C (Average Work)                                                                                    | B (Excellent Work)                                                                                          | A (Superior Work)                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Identification of Central Claim(s)</b> | Central claim(s) missing or inaccurate. Demonstrates no understanding of the reading. | Central claim(s) vaguely identified or partially misunderstood. Demonstrates very little understanding of the reading. | Central claim(s) identified with basic explanation. Demonstrates some understanding of the reading. | Central claim(s) clearly identified and explained in students' own words. Demonstrates solid understanding. | Central claim(s) precisely articulated in original language. Demonstrates nuanced understanding of stakes, assumptions, and implications.                   |
| <b>Synthesis of Key Arguments</b>         | No synthesis; ideas presented without any connection.                                 | Limited or superficial synthesis. Arguments weakly connected.                                                          | Basic synthesis of key arguments; connections present but underdeveloped.                           | Clear synthesis of arguments showing how they support the central claim(s).                                 | Sophisticated synthesis demonstrating strong critical analysis.                                                                                             |
| <b>Engagement with Course Themes</b>      | No meaningful connection to course themes or debates.                                 | Minimal or superficial connection to course themes.                                                                    | Adequate connection to relevant course themes (e.g., capitalism, crisis, transformation).           | Clear and thoughtful integration with course themes and discussions.                                        | Insightful integration across multiple course themes and readings; deepens understanding of broader course material.                                        |
| <b>Use of Examples / Case Studies</b>     | No examples provided or examples are irrelevant or inaccurate.                        | Examples minimally relevant or weakly developed.                                                                       | Relevant examples provided but connection to argument may be limited.                               | Strong, relevant examples clearly support or clarify arguments.                                             | Compelling and well-integrated examples used analytically to compliment, extend, and/or challenge arguments.                                                |
| <b>Lead an Engaging Discussion</b>        | Discussion questions missing or unclear. Little effort to invite class participation. | Discussion questions present but limited in scope; conversation remains brief or surface-level.                        | Discussion questions engage the topic and generate some meaningful conversation.                    | Well-developed, open-ended questions that invite critical, analysis, and connection to course themes.       | Carefully crafted questions that stimulate sustained, thoughtful dialogue and meaningful engagement with the central ideas and implications of the reading. |
| <b>Submission of Seminar Materials</b>    | Materials missing.                                                                    | Materials incomplete or unclear.                                                                                       | Materials submitted but minimally developed.                                                        | Materials submitted on time and clearly organized.                                                          | Materials thorough, well-organized, and reflective of careful intellectual preparation.                                                                     |