**Writing Fundamentals Rubric 2019-2020**



**A 4-year progressive rubric indicating performance on criteria expected at start of each year in college. ||| This is NOT a grading rubric.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator Areas** | **0 Deficient** | **1 Beginning** **(Needs Help) [FR]** | **2 Developing [SO]** | **3 Target [JR/SR]** | **4 Exemplary [GRAD]** |
| **Summary and Interpretation—The practice of understanding, explaining, and responding to the concepts and texts (sources/readings/data) that you write about.** | | | | | |
| **1.1 and 1.2**  **COMPREHENSION:**  Explaining and Responding to Concepts and Texts/Sources | * Writer rarely if ever explains or responds to concepts and texts called for in assignment. | * Writer gives basic but inconsistent explanations or responses to concepts and texts called for in assignment. | * Writer consistently gives basic explanations or responses to concepts and texts under discussion. | * Writer gives developed explanations and responses to concepts and texts relevant to his or her discussion. | * Writer explains and responds to a full range of concepts and texts relevant and meaningful to his or her in-depth and complex discussion. |
| * No basis for determining writer’s understanding of texts. | * Writer may sometimes misunderstand texts. | * Summaries and explanations of texts are usually accurate; inter-pretations usually valid. | * Summaries and explanations of texts are accurate; interpretations are valid. | * The process of interpretation is discussed reflectively. |
| **2.1**  **WORD CHOICE:** Use of Words | * Word choice is often inaccurate, creating confusion. | * Word choice is not always accurate and/or appropriate, but does not interfere with tracking main ideas. | * Word choice is accurate and includes discipline-specific vocabulary. | * Word choice, including discipline-specific vocabulary, is accurate and articulate. | * Word choice, including discipline-specific vocabulary, is articulate, nuanced, and varied. |
| **3.1, 3.2, and 3.3**  **ENTERING THE ACADEMIC CONVERSATION –**  **CITATION AND INTEGRATION OF SOURCES:**  Use of Sources | * Sources markedly underutilized or overutilized. | * Quality, scope, and/or number of sources do not support the writer in fulfilling his or her purpose. | * Sources may be lacking in terms of quality, scope, and number but, for the most part, support the writer in fulfilling his or her purpose. | * Quality, scope, and number of sources indicate extensive research and fully support the writer in fulfilling his or her purpose. | * Quality, scope, and number of quality sources indicate a thorough research process that supports the writer in going far beyond the minimum assignment requirements. |
| * Quotes are dropped into the piece with little introduction or explanation; few paraphrases or summaries are included or those that too closely resemble source text. | * Quotes, paraphrases, and summaries are included but sometimes lack adequate introduction or explanation. | * Source material is consistently introduced in ways that explain their relevance to the topic through use of quotes, paraphrases, and summaries. | * Writer traces the progression of a “conversation” among scholars through use of quotes, paraphrases, and summaries, and then engages in that conversation. | * Writer engages in the “conversation” among scholars through use of quotes, paraphrases, and summaries, and adds clear, original thought to that conversation. |
| * Sources have been used with no evidence of citation, including no bibliography. Plagiarism evident.\*   \*Any paper with evidence of extensive plagiarism (that is, beyond three local and unintentional instances) will automatically fail the WPF. | * Writer cites sources but patterns of stylistic errors may occur. Discrepancies occur between in-text citations and bibliography entries. Occasional citations may be missing. | * Writer consistently cites sources according to assigned style. Few unique errors (not patterns) may occur. | * Writer correctly cites sources and acknowledges the work and contributions of other scholars to the academic conversation in metadiscourse. | * In addition to demonstrating Target qualities in this criterion, writing can be described as one or more of the following: compelling, original, above and beyond the assignment. |
| **Evidence and Claims—The practice of identifying a question or problem, gathering evidence, and making conclusions/taking positions based on that evidence.** | | | | | |
| **4.1, 4.2, and 4.3**  **LOGICAL CONNECTIONS**: Evidence and Claims Align Logically | * Claims are not included, or, if included, are unrelated to assigned topic or to one another. | * Claims usually address a specific problem, but may not be stated clearly or may be buried within the text because the writer is still engaged in thinking through the question or problem. | * Claims are usually stated clearly and present a general position on a question or problem. | * Claims consistently present a focused position on a question or problem. | * Claims are prominent, logical, concise; claims present a focused position on a question or problem while taking the relative strengths of other positions into account. |
| * Little or no evidence is provided to support claims, or information is offered with few claims about why it is significant (i.e., a “data dump”). | * Evidence is often not concrete enough to support claims. | * Evidence is usually concrete enough to support claims. | * Evidence is relevant, specific, and logical in support of claims. | * In addition to Target qualities, claims and evidence represent a variety of positions on or viewpoints of the topic. |
| * No connections drawn between claims and evidence. | * Connections between claims and evidence are only sometimes explained. | * Connections between claims and evidence are usually explained. | * Writer aligns claims and evidence, develops connections between them, and draws conclusions. | * Writer uses his or her conclusions to propose new/original ideas. |
| **5.1 and 5.2**  **OVERALL ORGANIZATION AND LOGICAL ORDER:**  Use of Big Picture Structural Conventions to Orient Readers within Document | * The introduction to the piece fails to provide clear direction. It may contain contradictory claims, ideas that go off on a tangent, or an incomplete statement of purpose. | * An opening statement briefly introduces a topic, but lacks a clear statement of purpose as to why the problem or question being addressed matters. | * An opening statement of purpose explains why the problem or question being addressed matters. | * An opening statement of purpose explains the context of the problem or question being addressed and why that problem or question matters. | * In addition to demonstrating Target qualities in this criterion, writing can be described as one or more of the following: compelling, original, above and beyond the assignment. |
| * Evidence and claims are not presented in a clear sequence. | * The ideas in the piece are still in the development stage. Evidence and claims don’t always have a clear connection to the thesis or statement of purpose; the piece may even move towards an entirely different conclusion — indicating that the writing process has served as a means for thinking, but that further thought and revision is needed. | * Evidence and claims are usually presented in a logical sequence. | * Evidence and claims are presented in a logical sequence throughout. | * In addition to demonstrating Target qualities in this criterion, writing can be described as one or more of the following: compelling, original, above and beyond the assignment. |
| **Audience Awareness—The practice of guiding your reader through your ideas.** | | | | | |
| **6.1 and 6.2**  **CLARITY AND FLOW (PARAGRAPHING, TRANSITIONS, and SENTENCES):**  Use of Structural Conventions to Guide Readers and Make Meaning Clear | * Elements of prewriting, such as note-taking, inaccurate word choices, and incomplete or rambling sentences, predominate. | * Writing strategies such as key words or transitions that help readers understand the direction of the piece are rarely/sometimes used to guide readers through the sequence of ideas. | * Writing strategies such as key words, transitions, or topic sentences are consistently used to guide readers through the sequence of ideas. | * Multiple writing strategies — including transitions, key words, topic sentences, and reflective comments — are consistently used to guide readers through the sequence of ideas. | * In addition to demonstrating Target qualities in this criterion, writing can be described as one or more of the following: compelling, original, above and beyond the assignment. |
| * Not sufficiently organized or complete. Elements of a first draft such as multiple typos, syntax issues, awkward phrasing, and disjointed paragraphs are apparent throughout. | * Issues such as wandering ideas within paragraphs, convoluted sentences, and some * inconsistent wording indicate that the writer is still working primarily to generate his or her ideas and needs to engage more fully in a revision process that takes the reader into account. | * Indicators of adequate attention to audience are apparent in paragraphs that usually maintain a single focus, sentences that are generally well-structured, and wording that is consistent — allowing a clear message to be conveyed. | * Indicators of expert attention to audience are apparent in paragraphs that consistently maintain a single focus, sentences that are almost always well-structured, and wording that is consistent — allowing a clear message to be conveyed. | * Writer engages the reader in an exchange of ideas through use of well-developed paragraphs, polished sentences, and provocative wording that draws attention to the larger issues within the piece. |
| **7.1**  **MECHANICS:**  Use of Grammar and Punctuation Conventions | * Grammar and punctuation conventions are rarely followed; five to six patterns of grammar or punctuation errors, or multiple unique errors throughout, consistently make reading difficult. | * Grammar and punctuation conventions are sometimes followed; however, three to four patterns of grammar or punctuation errors, or multiple unique errors throughout, often make reading difficult. | * Grammar and punctuation conventions have mostly been followed; however, one to two patterns of grammar or punctuation errors occasionally make reading difficult. | * Grammar and punctuation conventions have been followed, making reading effortless. Isolated errors may occur. | * Grammar and punctuation conventions have been followed, making reading effortless. Writing is stylistically interesting, compelling, and clear. |