

UPPER-DIVISION WRITING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 2.0

CATEGORY 1: RHETORICAL AWARENESS / CRITICAL THINKING / VOICE

3: Accomplished: The writer or writers are clearly situated in the world. That means the writing demonstrates concretely human points of view and rhetorical awareness, such as good judgment about what topics to address, and what to include in the exposition. The writing is not inappropriately generic, vague, tonally/lexically AI-like, and/or inappropriately detached from details and perspectives that can only come from people.

2: Satisfactory: On balance the writing is not AI-like; the writer is situated in the world (as detailed above).

1: Emerging: The writing infrequently demonstrates concretely human points of view and rhetorical awareness – for example it often misjudges what topics to address, and what to include in the exposition. The writing is sometimes inappropriately AI-like. That means it is overall generic, vague, tonally/ lexically AI typical, and/or detached from details and perspectives that could only come from people.

0: Insufficient: The writing does not demonstrate concretely human points of view and rhetorical awareness. The writing is AI-like (as detailed above).

CATEGORY 2: HANDLING OF CONTENT

3: Accomplished: The writer's approach to the content is insightful, and/or creative, persuasive, unique, and worth developing. The ideas are clearly communicated with focus and specificity. The content is considered/addressed from several facets of the topic or perspectives, as it is tailored to the audience. Methods for handling content are field-specific and relevant.

2: Satisfactory: The writer's approach is acceptable, reasonable, thoughtful; the ideas offered are usually communicated clearly with specificity and focus – some are insightful. The writer demonstrates an awareness of other facets of the topic or perspectives. The writer seems to understand the relevant discourse and methods, and has taken some care to include content appropriate to the audience.

1: Emerging: The writer's approach is acceptable and reasonable but may require deeper thought or insight. The ideas offered are intermittently delineated, thought-through, and appropriate to the task. The writer attempts to show awareness of at least one other relevant facet of the topic or perspective. The writer includes content that is appropriate to the audience but may lack adequate care.

0: Insufficient: The writer's handling of content is inadequate or confusing. Although some of the ideas may be worth pursuing further, the content is generally unclear. The writer does not take into account other facets of the topic or perspectives, or does so in

an inappropriate or simplistic manner. The thinking lacks focus and clarity. There is little or no evidence of audience awareness.

CATEGORY 3: HANDLING OF EVIDENCE/RESEARCH

3: Accomplished: The writer uses credible evidence/sources appropriately and effectively with a clear understanding of the audience's expectations. The writer considers, if appropriate, the previous knowledge generated within the discipline (e.g., literature review). Evidence/sources 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 the writer's argument/purpose.

2: Satisfactory: Generally, the writer uses credible evidence/sources appropriately and effectively with a sufficient understanding of the audience's expectations. The writer sometimes considers, if appropriate, the previous knowledge generated within the discipline (e.g., literature review). Evidence/sources generally contribute to the argument/purpose, and are usually represented accurately and with clarity. Evidence/sources – including data tables or other visuals – are frequently well-integrated into the writer's argument/purpose (writer controls the ideas, sources do not).

1: Emerging: Occasionally the writer uses credible evidence/sources appropriately that advance the purpose/argument; audience expectations for sources/research are sometimes demonstrated. Evidence/sources are presented with some degree of clarity, though there are some simplistic readings or misreadings. Evidence/sources – including data tables and other visuals – are inconsistently integrated into the prose and may overwhelm the writer's purpose.

0: Insufficient: Evidence/sources, if present at all, are inappropriate, not credible, or misunderstood; the writing does not demonstrate understanding of the discipline's expectations for presenting evidence and using sources. Evidence/sources – including data tables or other visuals – are mismatched with the writer's purpose.

CATEGORY 4: DEVELOPMENT & STRUCTURE

3: Accomplished: The prose clearly illustrates the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse. The organization is apparent, coherent, and contributes to the writer's goals. The main purpose/thesis – insightful, specific, focused – 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 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 writer's goals. The development of ideas is

generally insightful, specific and focused, following a logical progression with appropriate transitions that connect the ideas and show logical relations between them; the reader is guided through the writer's chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

1: Emerging: The prose occasionally illustrates the writer's understanding of the genre/discipline's methods of organizing written discourse. The organization is sometimes apparent, coherent, and on occasion, contributes to the writer's goals. The development of ideas is intermittently 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 5: LANGUAGE & STYLE

3: Accomplished: The writing shows rhetorically effective variety and stylistic markers at the word, sentence, and paragraph level that reflect human effort. The mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and paragraphing) enhance overall readability and purpose and show evidence of careful human editing and proofreading – not AI homogenization. Citation style is appropriate to the discipline and genre.

2: Satisfactory: The writing often shows the rhetorically effective variety and stylistic markers at the word, sentence, and paragraph level that reflect human effort. The mechanics contribute to overall purpose and show evidence of human editing and proofreading. The presence of limited errors does not detract from readability. Citation style is appropriate to the discipline and genre.

1: Emerging: The writing sometimes shows the rhetorically effective variety and stylistic markers at the word, sentence, and paragraph level that reflect human effort. The mechanics sometimes diminish readability and may look like automated writing – e.g. Grammarly or ChatGPT – that homogenizes much of the prose. Writing shows some limited awareness of the citation style appropriate to the discipline and genre.

0: Insufficient A (non-automation/AI): The writing illustrates little or no facility with the variety and stylistic markers at the word, sentence, and paragraph level. Mechanics and the presence of errors throughout diminish readability. There is little or no awareness/presence of the citation style of the discipline and genre. **Insufficient B (automation/AI-like):** The writing is overwhelmingly AI-like insofar as it is inappropriately generic, vague, or tonally/lexically AI-like. Whether or not the writer actually relied heavily on automation like Grammarly or ChatGPT, the language and style markers do not consistently point back to the human writer.