

CMPT 376 Fall 2008 Assignment 3 (Final) **Student** _____ **Grade** _____

Quality	Excellent	Skilled	Substandard
Numeric argument			
Magnitude	Tells a story from the sizes of the values, telling what the similarities and differences imply.	Emphasizes the sizes of values as indicator of important similarities and differences.	Presents values with little regard for the story suggested by their sizes.
Articulation	Summarizes values well—captures big principles, notes important qualifications, but deliberately leaves out small variation.	Summarizes values into big principles but fails to qualify them OR only lists qualifications.	Weak arrangement of values into important principles.
Generality	Applies values to wide range of phenomena and possible applications.	Applies values to some phenomena and applications.	Leaves values close to context in which they were gathered.
Interestingness	Connects values to outcomes of high interest to this audience.	Mild or indirect connection to outcomes, or outcomes only moderately interesting.	Bare values with few to no implications.
Credibility	By presenting values in context of how they were gathered, draws implications for repeatability and generality of values.	Values partly connected to how they were gathered, some implications drawn.	Little to no consideration of how the way the values were gathered affects their usefulness.
Qualitative argument			
Facts and opinions	Clearly distinguishes facts and received opinions	External data and opinion not well-differentiated or only small amounts	Facts and received opinions undistinguished OR no external data
Counter-arguments	Accounts for possible counterarguments	Counterarguments listed but not integrated into the argument	Only presents arguments and facts in support of recommendation
Audience	Accounts for their needs and perspectives	Superficially considers audience	Little to no consideration of audience
Conclusion	Clear conclusion, accounting for complete points	Conclusion captures most points but some important ones left out	Conclusion not strongly indicated from stated points

Quality	Excellent	Skilled	Substandard
Structure			
Problem	Clearly stated	Stated broadly but not precisely	Never stated or unclear
Sequence	Argument <i>builds</i> , moving in small steps	Some steps too large or redundant	Argument <i>stumbles</i> , with steps out of sequence
Concepts	Introduced before use	Introduction and use intermingled	No consistent pattern
Steps	Clear intermediate stages	Only a few intermediate stages	Moves in leaps, gaps left
Metadiscourse	Explicitly marks steps of argument	Steps occasionally marked	Few to no markers of steps
Linking	Topics linked across paragraphs in “hook and eye” logic	Topics partly linked across paragraphs	Paragraphs not clearly linked
Style			
Formality	High but not elegant. Enough personal touches that reader gets sense of an individual author	Overly formal. No personal touches, forbidding OR touches of undue informality.	Informal, colloquial, cute. Conveys that this is a trivial or joking matter
Characters	Matched to sentence subjects	Sometimes matched to sentence subjects	Key characters are not sentence subjects
Actions	Matched to verbs	Some as verbs, some as nominalizations	Buried in nominalizations
New information	Sentences put familiar and simple first, new and complex last	Some sentences move from familiar and simple to new and complex	Sentences tend to begin with complex or unfamiliar information

Source of MAGIC criteria: Abelson, R. P. (1995). *Statistics as principled argument*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 12–14.