

UPPER-DIVISION WRITING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

CATEGORY 1: CRITICAL THINKING & ANALYSIS

3: Proficient: The approach to the assigned topic of study is insightful, and/or creative, persuasive, unique, and worth developing; the level of thinking/analysis is strong; the ideas are clearly communicated with focus and specificity; the topic is considered/addressed from several facets or perspectives; the writer understands discipline-specific methods for producing knowledge; the content is tailored to the disciplinary audience.

2: Satisfactory: The approach is acceptable, reasonable, thoughtful; the level of thinking/analysis is appropriate; the ideas offered are generally specific and focused, some are insightful, usually communicated clearly; the writer shows an awareness of other facets or perspectives; the writer seems to understand the disciplinary discourse and has taken some care in including content appropriate to the disciplinary audience.

1: Some: The approach is occasionally adequate; some evidence of thinking/analysis, or an attempt at analysis, is evident; the ideas offered are intermittently delineated, thought-through, and appropriate to the task; the writer attempts to show awareness of at least one other facet or perspective; the writer sporadically shows awareness of the disciplinary discourse and includes content that is relevant to the disciplinary audience.

0: Insufficient: The approach is inadequate or confusing; little or no evidence of critical thinking and analysis are evident; although some of the ideas may be worthwhile, the level of insight and clarity of presentation are lacking; the writer does not take into account other facets or perspectives, or does so in an inappropriate or simplistic manner; the thinking lacks focus and clarity, illustrates misconceptions; little or no evidence of awareness of the disciplinary audience.

CATEGORY 2: USE OF EVIDENCE/RESEARCH

3: Proficient: Uses evidence/sources appropriately and effectively, with a clear understanding of the disciplinary audience's expectations; considers (if appropriate) the previous knowledge generated within the discipline (e.g., literature review); evidence/sources used help develop and exemplify the overall argument/purpose of the writer; evidence/sources, including data tables or other visuals, are clearly and accurately represented and smoothly integrated into writer's argument/purpose.

2: Satisfactory: Generally uses evidence/sources appropriately and effectively, with understanding of the disciplinary audience's expectations; shows awareness (if appropriate) of the previous knowledge generated within the discipline (e.g., literature review); evidence/sources used generally contribute to the overall argument/purpose of the writer; evidence/sources are usually represented accurately and with clarity; evidence/sources, including data tables or other visuals, are often well integrated into writer's argument/purpose (writer controls the ideas, the sources do not).

1: Some: Evidence/sources have occasionally been used appropriately, and intermittently further the writer's purpose/argument; some evidence of disciplinary expectations for sources/research are evident; evidence/sources are presented with some degree of clarity, with some misreading or simplistic reading; the evidence/sources, including data tables or other visuals, may overwhelm the writer's own voice and purpose; evidence/sources are inconsistently integrated into the prose.

0: Insufficient: Evidence/sources, if present at all, are used inappropriately, simplistically, or misreading is evident; the writing shows little or no evidence of the writer's understanding of the discipline's expectations for presenting evidence and using sources; evidence/sources, including data tables or other visuals, are mis-matched with the writer's purpose within the prose.

CATEGORY 3: DEVELOPMENT & STRUCTURE

3: Proficient: The prose clearly reflects the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse; the organization is apparent, coherent, and contributes to the overall goals; the insightful, specific, focused development of the main purpose/thesis is effectively organized in paragraphs or sections (as appropriate to the genre/discipline); sophisticated transitional devices help to develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations; the reader is effortlessly guided through the writer's chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

2: Satisfactory: The prose generally illustrates the writer's understanding of the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse; the organization is usually apparent, coherent, and contributes to the overall goals; the development of ideas is generally insightful, specific and focused, following a logical progression; appropriate transitions connect the ideas and show relations between them; the reader is guided through the writer's chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

1: Some: The prose sporadically illustrates the writer's understanding of the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse; the organization is intermittently apparent, coherent, and on occasion, contributes to the overall goals; the development of ideas is somewhat insightful, specific, focused, and logical; transitional devices are inconsistently employed to connect the ideas; the reader can occasionally follow the writer's chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

0: Insufficient: The prose does not clearly illustrate the writer's understanding of the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse; organization is random, simplistic or inappropriately sequential, and rarely (if ever) contributes to the overall goals; little or no development of ideas is evident, with limited insight, focus or logic; the writing has little or no internal coherence, using few or inappropriate transitional devices; the reader has difficulty following the writer's chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

CATEGORY 4: LANGUAGE & STYLE CONVENTIONS

3: Proficient: The writing is styled and eloquent, with an easy flow, rhythm, and cadence; sentences have clear purpose and varied structure; sentences and paragraphing show skill with a wide range of rhetorical, disciplinary, or generic conventions; the writer chooses words for their precise meanings and uses an appropriate level of specificity, illustrating his/her facility with the discipline's discourse; mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and paragraphing) enhance overall readability and purpose; writing free of errors, evidence of careful editing and proofreading. Correct and appropriate use of citation methods for the discipline and genre.

2: Satisfactory: The writing is generally appropriately styled and has a flow, rhythm, and cadence; sentences are purposeful and varied in structure; sentences and paragraphing typically show appropriate use of rhetorical, disciplinary, or generic conventions; the writer generally chooses words for their precise meanings and uses an appropriate level of specificity, illustrating his/her understanding of the discipline's discourse; mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and paragraphing) contribute to overall purpose; writing is almost free of errors, with evidence of editing and proofreading; limited errors do not detract from readability. Correct and appropriate use of citation methods for the discipline and genre.

1: Some: The writing sometimes illustrates aspects of style, rhythm, and cadence appropriate to the discipline/genre; sentences are somewhat varied in structure and occasionally show the writer's understanding of how to use rhetorical, disciplinary, or generic conventions; the writer sporadically chooses words for their precise meanings and uses some level of specificity; mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and paragraphing) are sometimes detracting from readability and inconsistently contribute to overall purpose; errors occur, and occasionally detract from readability. Some awareness of citation methods for the discipline and genre.

0: Insufficient: The writing illustrates little or no ability to use style, rhythm, and cadence; sentences generally lack purpose, with little or no variety in structure; sentences and paragraphing show a lack of understanding of how to use rhetorical, disciplinary, or generic conventions; word choice is typically inappropriate and generalized, showing a limited understanding of disciplinary discourse; mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and paragraphing) detract (or rarely contribute to) from readability and overall purpose; errors occur throughout, illustrating an inability to control language or a lack of editing and proofreading. Little or no awareness/presence of citation methods for the discipline and genre.