Rubric Oct. 5th 2025

Changes: Added two more strands for each criteria to emphasize the nuances and raise the ceiling

1. Clarity & Flow

- Strand 1: Lacks clarity, disjointed, difficult to follow. Communication obstructs understanding.
- Strand 2: Basic coherence, but clumsy or inconsistent flow. Ideas are traceable, but expression often hinders understanding.
- Strand 3: Clear and cohesive; transitions mostly effective. Communication generally enhances understanding.
- Strand 4: Lucid and rhythmically pleasing; stylistically elegant while remaining accessible. Ideas build logically and consistently.
- Strand 5: Stylistically distinguished, with aphoristic or lyrical prose. Density and complexity enrich clarity. Structural cohesion and artistry are in perfect balance.

---

2. Depth of Interpretation

- Strand 1: Limited insight; surface-level commentary or description.
- Strand 2: Some analysis but often generic or shallow; interpretation lacks originality.
- Strand 3: Solid multi-layered interpretation; engages with the prompt seriously. Some perceptive insights.
- Strand 4: Sophisticated analysis; uncovers unexpected dimensions. Significant nuance, with strong originality through reframing and synthesis.
- Strand 5: Philosophically profound; reframes the problem itself, challenging conventional categories. Superb nuance, originality, and conceptual daring.

---

3. Responsiveness to the Prompt

- Strand 1: Partial response; addresses only fragments of the prompt without exploring implications.
- Strand 2: Addresses the prompt but misses nuances; occasional drift or superficial engagement.
- Strand 3: Fully engages in a conventional sense; unpacks the prompt carefully, addressing key implications.
- Strand 4: Engages creatively with nuances; reframes aspects of the question with originality.
- Strand 5: Subverts or critiques the very terms of the prompt while delivering a coherent, insightful response.

---

4. Profound / Interesting Ideas

- Strand 1: Predictable or derivative ideas; factual without significance.
- Strand 2: Some originality; occasionally thought-provoking.
- Strand 3: Original and engaging; several strong insights with meaningful synthesis.
- Strand 4: Highly original and daring; offers distinctive synthesis and provocative reframing.
- Strand 5: Conceptually groundbreaking; ideas are generative, memorable, even publishable. Bold, risky, and deeply profound.

---

5. Risk-Taking

- Strand 1: Plays it safe; minimal risks, derivative commentary.
- Strand 2: Small attempts at originality or unconventional style, but mostly conventional.
- Strand 3: Willingness to push ideas or style beyond safe conventions.
- Strand 4: Bold experimentation in structure, style, or interpretation. Risks enrich rather than undermine the argument.
- Strand 5: Radical, uncompromising risk—may be rough in places, but transformative in ambition. Critiques or reframes the very terms of debate.

---

6. Scope

- Strand 1: Narrow, insular, single-faceted perspective.
- Strand 2: Brings in a few perspectives, but engagement is shallow or mostly descriptive.
- Strand 3: Adequate breadth; considers multiple dimensions with some nuance.
- Strand 4: Interdisciplinary synthesis; integrates varied domains meaningfully. Strong cohesion and nuance.
- Strand 5: Expansive, cosmopolitan scope; philosophy, literature, history, science, and personal insight woven seamlessly. Radically integrative and compelling.