

## Advanced Writing Rubric

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Rater \_\_\_\_\_

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<p><b>Concept</b></p> <p><b>Thesis/Focus/Content</b>                      A. purpose clearly stated                      B. content supports thesis                      C. conclusion appropriate</p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The paper has an arguable, interesting thesis which is sufficiently limited in scope and is a controlling feature of the paper. <b>[B]</b> Content supports the thesis and is substantial and appropriate. <b>[C]</b> Conclusion is well considered and is a synthesis rather than a summary.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The thesis might be unclear or vague, and the paper as a consequence loses focus. <b>[B]</b> The content may occasionally digress from the point. Support is less convincing. <b>[C]</b> Conclusion is less in the way of synthesis and leans toward summary. It might feature an awkwardly restatement of the thesis, but achieves closure.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Thesis neither forceful nor significant. The paper's focus might be inferred by the reader, but is weak, diffused, and ineffective. <b>[B]</b> Paper may contain the occasional divergence and support for the thesis is scant and disjointed. <b>[C]</b> Conclusion is underdeveloped, awkward, and possibly only a brief sentence tagged onto the paper. It fails to adequately synthesize the paper's content.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Thesis is missing or hopelessly confusing. Little or no focused development. Paper seems to drift aimlessly toward some unknown destination. No focus or direction of the argument is evident. <b>[B]</b> Purpose of content not readily evident. <b>[C]</b> Conclusion is absent, or contains inappropriate material (new evidence, statistical data, introduction of new ideas, etc.).</p>
<p><b>Organization</b>                      A. logical development                      B. transition achieve coherence                      C. considers other points of view</p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Organization is logical, clear, direct and to the point. <b>[B]</b> Links from paragraph to paragraph (even sentence to sentence) are obvious. Writer uses transition words and devices to achieve coherence and unity. <b>[C]</b> Opposing points of view are considered as appropriate. The paper is engaging and easily read.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Generally follows a logical development, with occasional lapses and divergences. <b>[B]</b> Some transitions are awkward and the reader infers connections between ideas. <b>[C]</b> Weak analysis of counterpoints.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Paper is constructed around a major idea, however, the logical development is unclear at times, and support is often generalized rather than specific. <b>[B]</b> Uneven flow from idea to idea causes slight confusion and weakens the argument. <b>[C]</b> Divergent opinions are mentioned, but not developed.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Generally confusing. Content fails to defend the thesis. The paper has a "rambling" quality. <b>[B]</b> Ideas are arranged haphazardly with no evidence of connectedness. <b>[C]</b> Lack of development and failure to consider other points of view.</p>
<p><b>Style</b>                      A. proper level of diction                      B. correct use of terminology                      C. definition of terms                      D. sentence variety                      E. tone</p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Language is appropriate for the given audience. <b>[B]</b> Acronyms used only when appropriate. <b>[C]</b> Writer clearly defines complex and ambiguous terms. Diction facilitates an academic bearing and is sophisticated, while simultaneously avoiding an inflated style. <b>[D]</b> Writer uses a variety of sentence lengths and styles and is aware of the overall</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Language is generally effective, yet does not rise to a higher level of sophistication and readability. <b>[B]</b> Use of terminology tends to confuse rather than clarify the writer's point. <b>[C]</b> Marked by somewhat vague terms. <b>[D]</b> Sentences generally lack stylistic merit and demonstrate a stylistic sameness. <b>[E]</b> Tone is uneven and possibly inappropriate in</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Simplistic in tone and diction. <b>[B]</b> Writer does not consider audience when using terms and jargon. <b>[C]</b> Terms inadequately defined and possible even confusing in spots. <b>[D]</b> Sentences tend to be simplistic and tone is inconsistent in general. <b>[E]</b> May be difficult to follow in places and exhibits an elementary style.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Overall, difficult to read. <b>[B]</b> Riddled with jargon and confusing terms. Marked by an elementary vocabulary and style. <b>[C]</b> Terminology is either absent, or hopelessly confusing. May contain technical errors, lack of paragraphing, diction intended to impress, yet is inappropriate within context. <b>[D]</b> No variety in syntactic structure. Lack of sentence variety produces a</p>

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<b>Concept</b>	tone of the writing. [E] Text is stimulating and readable.	spots.		monotone effect. Sentences are simplistic and fail to convey complex ideas. [E] Tone is inappropriate.
<b>Mechanics</b> A. grammar B. punctuation C. spelling D. word usage  <b>Score =</b>	<b>[A]</b> Paper demonstrates writer's familiarity with grammatical concepts. Little or no surface detail errors. <b>[B]</b> Punctuation is appropriate and <b>[C]</b> there are few (if any) spelling errors. <b>[D]</b> Writer does not confuse homonyms (to, too), employs parallelism where appropriate, and uses capitals correctly.	<b>[A]</b> Although an occasional error may be found, these minor mistakes do not detract from the overall impact of the paper. <b>[B]</b> Writer clearly demonstrates a thorough grasp of punctuation <b>[C]</b> spelling, and <b>[D]</b> word usage, and although a few errors may be evident they do not contribute to an overall devaluation of the thought and/or argument presented in the paper.	<b>[A]</b> Grammatical errors tend to detract for the holistic effect of the paper. Although this paper contains errors, they are of the less grievous sort. Although sentence fragments are not acceptable for a satisfactory paper, the occasional error in <b>[B]</b> punctuation or <b>[C]</b> spelling may be evident. <b>[D]</b> Minor errors in usage (their instead of there) may also appear, but are infrequent and do not hinder the reader.	<b>[A]</b> The accumulation of error tends to diminish the authority and credibility of the writer. Number of errors detracts from the holistic effectiveness of the paper. Marked by simple errors in <b>[B]</b> punctuation, <b>[C]</b> spelling, and <b>[D]</b> usage. Some sentences may be garbled to the point of meaninglessness. Paper can be read only with great difficulty and effort.
<b>Discipline Specific Components Added Here</b>  <b>Score =</b>				

Rubric2a.doc

## Sample Discipline-Specific Writing Rubric

### 1. Traditional Research Paper

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<p><b>Concept</b></p> <p><b>A. thesis clearly stated</b>  <b>B. support of thesis</b>  <b>C. coherent argument</b>  <b>D. documentation</b>  <b>E. formatting</b>  <b>F. use of secondary sources</b></p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The paper has an arguable, interesting thesis which is sufficiently limited in scope and is a controlling feature of the paper. <b>[B]</b> Content supports the thesis and is substantial and appropriate. <b>[C]</b> The argument is presented in a clearly coherent, understandable, and logical fashion. <b>[D]</b> Documentation of secondary sources is effective and follows the discipline's style manual. <b>[E]</b> The specific formatting conventions of the discipline are followed. <b>[F]</b> An acceptable blend of summary, paraphrase, and direct quotes are skillfully woven into a forceful, original argument with credit clearly given to authors of secondary sources.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The thesis might be unclear or vague, and the paper as a consequence loses focus. <b>[B]</b> The content may occasionally digress from the point. Support is less convincing. <b>[C]</b> The writer may occasionally stray from the primary focus, but overall the paper moves through a logical, coherent progression to reach a conclusion. <b>[D]</b> Documentation is present, but attribution might be unclear in places. <b>[E]</b> In general, the formatting follows the appropriate style manual with the occasional error. <b>[F]</b> Generally, the writer shows skill in using secondary sources; however the occasional over reliance on the sources, too many quotations, or even too few quotations might detract from the overall effectiveness.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Thesis neither forceful nor significant. The paper's focus might be inferred by the reader, but is weak, diffused, and ineffective. <b>[B]</b> Paper may contain the occasional divergence and support for the thesis is scant and disjointed. <b>[C]</b> The argument is uneven and disjointed in places, often as though the writer has lost focus. <b>[D]</b> Documentation is unclear and often confusing, marked by unclear attributions. <b>[E]</b> Formatting strays from the standards of the discipline in places but this only minimally detracts from the paper's total impact. <b>[F]</b> Either the writer follows the original sources too closely, or fails to use the original source to best advantage—possibly "padding" parts of the paper with lengthy quotes—or avoiding them.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Thesis is missing or hopelessly confusing. Little or no focused development. Paper seems to drift aimlessly toward some unknown destination. No focus or direction of the argument is evident. <b>[B]</b> Purpose of content not readily evident. <b>[C]</b> Argument is disjointed, inarticulate, and extremely difficult to follow. <b>[D]</b> Documentation is absent, misleading, erroneous, or falsified. <b>[E]</b> Writer displays a total disregard of conventions governing paper production in this discipline. <b>[F]</b> Sources of original intellectual information are ignored, or simply plagiarized. Writer fails to understand the nature of the paper assignment, possibly confusing it with an analysis.</p>

## Sample Discipline-Specific Writing Rubric

### 2. Analysis (Causal)

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<p><b>Concept</b></p> <p>A. effect to be analyzed.                      B. causal chain                      C. reasoning                      D. counterevidence                      E. conclusion</p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Writer clearly identifies the paper’s topic, defining any ambiguous terms. <b>[B]</b> Paper makes clear all connections among ideas, creating a chain of evidence and causality. <b>[C]</b> Reasoning processes (induction, experimentation, analogy, etc.) clearly identified. <b>[D]</b> Paper offers reasonable counterevidence and analyzes reliability of these counter-arguments. <b>[E]</b> Paper offers a reasonable summary conclusion derived directly from the evidence offered in the analysis.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Focus of the paper is evident, but less forceful and direct than desired. <b>[B]</b> Although a chain of evidence is presented, coherence is unclear creating a disjointed connection among the various points of evidence. <b>[C]</b> Vague evidence of reasoning processes, possibly a result of failure to clearly define method of analysis. <b>[D]</b> Counterevidence is present; however, not fully defined. <b>[E]</b> Conclusion is present, but not authoritative or convincing.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Subject of analysis is obvious, trivial, or uninteresting. <b>[B]</b> Argument fails to create a clear progression of points of analysis. <b>[C]</b> Logic is confused and muddled. <b>[D]</b> Paper acknowledges counterevidence only in passing, offering little in the way of detailed explanation or connection to the writer’s thesis. <b>[E]</b> Conclusion is minimal and only marginally related to the primary impetus of the paper.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Paper lacks focus and drifts aimlessly. <b>[B]</b> The parts of the analysis appear unconnected to each other, as though a series of random thoughts without connection. <b>[C]</b> Reasoning process is unstated, leaving the reader to infer the connections among various points. <b>[D]</b> Paper avoids acknowledgement of counterevidence. <b>[E]</b> Conclusion is absent, fails to relate in any meaningful way with the rest of the paper, or is minimized to the point of being insignificant.</p>

### Sample Discipline-Specific Writing Rubric

#### 3. Technical Report

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<p><b>Concept</b></p> <p><b>A. problem statement</b>  <b>B. methodology</b>  <b>C. presentation of data</b>  <b>D. clarity of thought</b>  <b>E. comprehensiveness</b>  <b>F. precision</b>  <b>G. formatting</b></p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Problem is clearly conceived and articulated. <b>[B]</b> Process is sound and suitable for the particular inquiry. <b>[C]</b> Data is presented in the most appropriate format (charts, graphs, tables, etc. <b>[D]</b> Writing demonstrates a clear progression and cohesiveness of thought <b>[E]</b> Problem is both significant and fully treated—not an oversimplification <b>[F]</b> Problem is expressed in clear, direct, precise and unambiguous prose. <b>[G]</b> The physical appearance of the paper (to include headings, subheadings, attachments, illustrations) corresponds to standard practice for the discipline.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The problem statement is less clearly articulated and somewhat muddled. <b>[B]</b> Although there is a clear method of development, writer may occasionally experience lapses in technique. <b>[C]</b> Writer attempts to express data in the most appropriate manner with occasional lapses in judgment in choices. <b>[D]</b> Even though there is a clear focus, the paper might, on occasion, seem less clear and direct than might be desirable. <b>[E]</b> Writer might engage in generalized or inappropriate subject matter, or ignore substantive arguments. <b>[F]</b> Language is vague and non-specific in spots, but overall the writer chooses words carefully and frames ideas thoughtfully. <b>[G]</b> The paper generally adheres to standard practice.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Problem statement is ill-conceived or incomplete. <b>[B]</b> Methodology is inappropriate or unsuitable. <b>[C]</b> Data is unclear, and possible not presented in the best format <b>[D]</b> Paper seems more of a probing of possibilities and less a direct means to an end. Thought process are muddled or unclearly stated. <b>[E]</b> Gaps in the thoroughness and completeness of the argument are obvious. <b>[F]</b> Writing is marked by poor word choices, confusing prose and a general lack of clarity and directness. <b>[G]</b> Formatting is eclectic and strays from acceptable models.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> Statement of the problem is confusing, inappropriate, or entirely absent <b>[B]</b> Method of achieving a solution is poorly conceived or fails to adhere to standard, acceptable methods. <b>[C]</b> Data is irrelevant, confusing, poorly delineated, or absent. <b>[D]</b> Writer engages in logical fallacies and unsound methods. <b>[E]</b> Paper is marked by a trivialization of the subject, as well as evidence of incomplete or disjointed grasp of the problem. <b>[F]</b> Word choices inappropriate, confusing, and misleading, causing general confusion on the part of the reader. <b>[G]</b> Little or no attention to the standard formatting techniques of the discipline is evident.</p>

## Sample Discipline-Specific Writing Rubric

### 4. Business Proposal

Performance	Exceptional = 4	Average = 3	Minimal = 2	Unacceptable = 1
<p><b>Concept</b></p> <p>A. purpose B. research C. solution D. impact E. conclusion</p> <p><b>Score =</b></p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The rationale for the proposal is stated precisely. <b>[B]</b> Evidence clarifying the problem and/or solution is clearly stated and documented. <b>[C]</b> Solutions to the problem are identified and enumerated effectively. <b>[D]</b> An analysis of appropriate impacts (cost, time, personnel, etc.) is concisely stated. <b>[E]</b> A complete summary conclusion effectively articulates the total impact of the proposal.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The reason for the proposal is clear, but not fully developed or stated clearly. <b>[B]</b> Supporting research is incomplete or only tangentially related to the problem. <b>[C]</b> Solution leans toward vague generalization; however, it is clearly an attempt to solve the problem. <b>[D]</b> Ramifications of the proposal tend toward superficiality and incompleteness. <b>[E]</b> The summarizing conclusion is brief, simplistic, or indecisive.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The purpose might be vague, or possibly implied rather than stated directly and forcefully. <b>[B]</b> Research is minimal or non-existent. <b>[C]</b> Solution is untenable, unrealistic, or unrealistic. <b>[D]</b> The impact is inadequately analyzed, superficial, or not expressed clearly. <b>[E]</b> The conclusion is absent, too brief to be useful, or vague.</p>	<p><b>[A]</b> The writer fails to define a purpose for writing, or expresses the purpose in a weak, vague fashion that ultimately leads to confusion rather than clarification. <b>[B]</b> Research is missing, off topic, or not directly relevant to the problem. <b>[C]</b> Solution is unacceptable or difficult to connect to the reasoning process which should precede it. <b>[D]</b> Impact is not considered, or possibly treated in a dismissive fashion. <b>[E]</b> The conclusion fails to summarize, is tagged on as an afterthought, or leads to confusion, diminishing the total effect of the paper.</p>