**Written Communication Assessment Rubric: English Composition and Flexible Core**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ILO | Flexible Core | Rubric |
| Research and communicate effectively | Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view. | 4a. Engagement with Sources |
| 4b. Choice of sources |
|  | 3. Organization and Coherency |
|  | 5. Style and grammar |
| Think critically and creatively | Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions. | 1. Focus and thesis |
| Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically. | 2. Argumentation and evidence |
| Practice Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility |  | 4c Integration and attribution of sources |

**Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceeds Expectations** | | **Meets Expectations** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Competent** | **Weak** | **Failure** |
| **1. Focus and Thesis:** Responds to the assignment with a clear, specific central focus and thesis. | Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic, and responds to the topic with a clear, specific, relevant, and nuanced thesis or question. | Identifies a focused and manageable topic and responds to the topic with a clear, specific, and relevant thesis or question, though it may slightly rely on the obvious or vague. | Identifies a manageable topic and responds to the topic with a thesis or question but focus may be somewhat broad, general, or vague or might rely on the obvious. | Identifies a topic that is far too general or too specific to be manageable and responds with a thesis or question that is too broad, vague, or obvious | Identifies a topic that is far too general or too specific to be manageable and responds with a thesis or question that is too obvious or it lacks a thesis or focus |
| **2. Argumentation and Evidence:** Explores the focus through well-reasoned arguments and evidence and methods appropriate to the topic, context, purpose, and audience. Displays critical thinking about the topic. | Explores and develops the thesis or question with well-reasoned arguments and a range of appropriate supporting evidence and methods. Fully evaluates, analyzes, and explains all evidence. | Mostly explores and develops the thesis or question with well-reasoned arguments and a range of appropriate evidence, but may rely too much on one type of evidence or method. Mostly fully evaluates, explains, and analyzes all evidence. | Provides some development, with reasoning and supporting evidence, but may rely too much on one type of evidence or method or may not be the most appropriate or effective evidence and methods. Some evaluation, explanation, and analysis of evidence. | Provides some development but contains too much generality and reasoning could have some flaws or may rely on inappropriate evidence that is not always evaluated, explained, or analyzed. Thinking and argumentation may be too simplistic. | Does not provide sufficient development of the focus. Offers either no reasoning or flawed reasoning and inappropriate or no engagement with evidence that is not evaluated, explained, and analyzed. |
| **3. Organization and Coherency**: Begins with an effective introduction and develops logical sequencing of ideas leading to a clear conclusion. | Sets up a clear and interesting context for the thesis in the introduction. Clearly divides, arranges, and develops paragraphs. Uses transitions to enable the reader to make connections between ideas. Ends with a clear and effective conclusion. | Sets up a context for the thesis in the introduction. Clearly divides, arranges, and develops paragraphs, though a few could use work. Uses transitions to enable the reader to make connections between ideas. Ends with a clear conclusion. | Contains a general sense of organization, with some paragraphs seemingly misplaced or undeveloped. Contains an introduction and conclusion, but they may be too general and lack context for the thesis. Does not always use clear transitions, making the paper seem disjointed. | Does not contain a clear sense of organization. May have an unclear or nonexistent introduction and conclusion. Lacks clear paragraph development and transitions between ideas. | Does not contain a clear sense of organization. May seem haphazard and arbitrary. |
| **4a. Information Literacy: Engagement with Sources:** Draws from a variety of sources to support, deepen, extend, qualify, and/or question the argument or inquiry. | Uses sources to synthesize the research and enter a conversation on the topic. Engages in a conversation with the ideas of others. | Uses sources in several ways, but may rely too much on use of sources as support only. Engages in a conversation with the ideas of others though some places may not fully engage with the source. | Uses sources mostly as support with some engagement with the ideas of others. | Uses sources only as support with minimal engagement with the ideas of others. May take the ideas of others as fact, without question. | Demonstrates a lack of understanding of effective use of sources. Does not engage with the ideas of others. |
| **4b. Information Literacy: Choice of Sources:** Chooses the most effective sources for the topic and purpose that show variety in approach/point of view | Cites a variety of sources in terms of point of view expressed and type of source, which are appropriate for the topic and purpose. | Cites a variety of sources, but relies too much on certain views or types of sources, though they are appropriate for the topic and purpose. | Cites too many similar type of sources in terms of point of view and type of source. Relies too much on certain kinds of sources and may not use the best sources for the topic and purpose. | Cites sources that meet the minimum requirements of the assignment. Sources chosen are not the best for the topic and purpose. | Does not meet the minimum requirements of a research paper in terms of sources chosen. |
| **4c. Integration and Attribution of Sources:** Demonstrates knowledge of when and how to incorporate quotation, paraphrase, and summary, and uses proper attribution. | Demonstrates knowledge of when and how to incorporate quotation, paraphrase, and summary. Integrates sources effectively and uses proper attribution according to disciplinary conventions. | Varies between quotation, paraphrase, and summary. There may be places where a source could be better integrated or explained. Uses proper attribution according to disciplinary conventions | Relies too much on quotation. Sources not always integrated effectively. Effort is made at proper attribution according to disciplinary conventions. | May use long, irrelevant quotations or fail to integrate quotations effectively. Attribution is confusing. There may be places where it is unclear what material came from what source, though it is clear the paper is not intentionally plagiarizing. | Does not show understanding of integration of sources. Quotations dropped-in, unexplained, or unclear. Unclear attribution may be bordering on plagiarism. |
| **5. Style and Grammar:** Uses style appropriate to the topic, genre, audience, and purpose. Demonstrates knowledge of grammatical and mechanical conventions. | Uses clear, concise style appropriate to an academic context. Contains few, if any, grammatical or mechanical errors that distract the reader or compromise clarity. | Uses clear and mostly concise style. May be wordy or unclear in places. Is relatively free of grammatical or mechanical errors, which do not compromise clarity. | Uses clear style, but may lack concision and preciseness. May have errors that show inadequate knowledge of sentence structure and errors may compromise clarity. | Uses general and unclear language. Makes grammatical and mechanical errors that make it hard to understand the meaning of the sentences. | Contains so many grammatical errors that much of the paper is incomprehensible. |