Writing Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary = 4	Achieving = 3	Developing = 2	Beginning = 1
Creating documents appropriate for specific audiences, purposes, genres, disciplines, and professions.	Demonstrates a mature understanding of disciplinary issues related to context, audience, and purpose in relation to assigned task, plus mastery of conventions related to genre, presentation, and formatting.	Demonstrates informed consideration of ways to accommodate context, audience, and purpose in relation to assigned task. Uses conventions of formatting or presentation style appropriate to discipline or writing task.	Demonstrates some awareness of context, audience, and purpose as they relate to assigned task (e.g., awareness of audience perceptions and assumptions). Uses a style of formatting or presentation (e.g. sub-heads) suitable to the topic.	Demonstrates emerging awareness of context, audience, and purpose as they relate to the assigned task (e.g., responds to expectations of instructor or self as audience). Uses a system for basic formatting and presentation.
Crafting cogent and defensible applications, analyses, evaluations, and arguments about problems, ideas, and issues.	Uses relevant and compelling evidence, details, arguments and/or explanations that demonstrate mastery of the subject. Arguments and applications are internally consistent; evidence and analysis is consistently situated within the discipline and genre.	Uses relevant evidence, details, arguments and/or explanations to explore ideas or communicate information within the context of the discipline. Most aspects of argument or application are consistent; evidence and analysis is situated within the discipline and genre.	Uses some relevant evidence, details, arguments and/or explanations to develop and communicate information or ideas in parts of the work. Some arguments or applications may be inconsistent; some evidence or analysis may be inappropriate to the discipline or genre.	Uses some evidence, details, arguments, and/or explanations to develop or convey simple ideas in parts of the work. Arguments or applications may be inconsistent; evidence or analysis may be inappropriate to the discipline or genre.
Producing documents that are well organized, focused, and cohesive.	Articulates effectively the scope of the project; its thesis, focus, or purpose; key issues or parts. Types of information presented are clearly relevant to research question or topic. Organizational logic is clear and effective.	Defines the scope of the project and its thesis, focus, or purpose. Can determine key issues, though these may not be optimally emphasized or prioritized. Types of information presented are appropriate to research question or topic.	Defines focus or purpose of project, perhaps too broadly or narrowly. Determines at least one key issue. A few points or types of information are appropriate to topic or question. Organizational logic may be undefined or ineffective.	Articulates focus and purpose of project unclearly. Identifies at least one key issue, but types of information presented may not be clearly related to topic or argument. Organizational logic is lacking or ineffective.
Using appropriate vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, diction, and sentence structure.	Uses polished language that communicates meaning to intended readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses language appropriate to the discipline or task that conveys clear meaning to readers. The language in the text has few errors and they do not impede meaning.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers; may include some distracting sentence-level errors.	Uses language that is not appropriate to the task or discipline or that impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
Collecting and employing source materials ethically and understanding their strengths and limitations.	Uses correctly all relevant information use strategies: citations and references; choice of paraphrase, summary, or quotation; framing information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.	Uses correctly three of these information use strategies: citations and references; choice of paraphrase, summary, or quotation; framing information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge & ideas requiring attribution.	Uses correctly two of these information use strategies: citations and references; choice of paraphrase, summary, or quotation; framing information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.	Uses correctly one of the following information use strategies: citations and references; choice of paraphrase, summary, or quotation; uses information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.
Understanding, questioning, analyzing, and synthesizing complex textual, numeric, and graphical sources.	Demonstrates thorough evaluation and analysis of relevance, reliability, and completeness of source(s). Clearly distinguishes between fact and opinion. Identifies important details and accurately interprets information. Synthesis nuanced and clearly articulated.	Demonstrates attention to evaluation and analysis of relevance, reliability, and completeness of source(s). Distinguishes between fact and opinion. Identifies most important details. Analysis and interpretation of source information occasionally questionable, but generally accurate. Synthesis productive and workmanlike.	Attempts rudimentary evaluation and analysis of relevance or validity of source(s). Does not consistently distinguish between fact and opinion. Identifies some important details, but may contain incomplete analysis or incorrect interpretations. Synthesis underdeveloped.	Repeats source information without clear attention to relevance or validity; may not distinguish between fact and opinion. Identifies few important details. May misinterpret or offer an incomplete or biased interpretation of source information. Articulation of analysis and/or synthesis minimal.
Evaluating evidence, issues, ideas and problems from multiple perspectives.	Productively analyzes and evaluates evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from differing perspectives with reference to relevant contexts. May offer explicit comparison of perspectives presented. Clearly explains reasoning and makes insightful connections to concepts and context information available in class readings and other sources. Offers ethical and informed analysis of alternative points of view.	Identifies the perspective(s) and context(s) that frame some relevant evidence or ideas. Evaluates some significant issues or problems with reference to relevant viewpoint(s) or context(s); may attempt to compare or contrast differing perspectives. Does not rely on preconceived notions, but may not sufficiently explain reasoning. Demonstrates familiarity with concepts or context information from class texts and other relevant sources. Offers attentive analysis of alternative points of view.	Makes some attempt to identify and analyze the perspective(s) or context(s) of some evidence or ideas. Shows emerging awareness of the need to consider viewpoint or context when evaluating issues and problems. Does not rely entirely on preconceived notions; makes some connection to concepts or context information from class texts or other relevant sources. May offer superficial or questionable analysis of alternative points of view.	Makes a limited attempt to analyze and identify the perspectives and contexts that frame ideas, evidence, issues, or problems. Evaluates evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from a single point of view; may rely on preconceived notions. Makes few or no connections to relevant concepts or context information in class texts or other available sources. Ignores or offers a biased interpretation of alternative points of view.