

FAU Writing Across the Curriculum Student Writing Assessment Rubric: 4-Point Primary Traits

Please mark the appropriate number following each primary trait.

PURPOSE:

This rubric evaluates substantial, argument-driven, out-of-class papers. Typically such papers develop a thesis in which students build a case for a particular analysis, interpretation, or evaluation of data/readings that leads to recommendations or specific conclusions.

OPENING:

A) thesis/purpose/argument: primary argument

B) organizational statement/framework (set of statements): description of how the argument will proceed

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
A) thesis/purpose/argument	Fully articulates primary argument in fully explained, relevant context at the beginning of the paper. Paper follows through fully with stated thesis and demonstrates substantial critical analysis of subject that is not over-simplified .	Generally articulates primary argument in its general context at the beginning of the paper. Paper follows through generally with stated thesis, offers some critical analysis , and is not over-simplified .	Vaguely or partially articulates primary argument with minimal context in the paper. Paper may not or may partially follow through with stated thesis. Often, papers offer little or no critical analysis of the subject and present over-simplified thinking . (often 5 paragraph theme)	May not articulate primary argument or provide context anywhere in the paper. Follow through is not discernible . Subject may simply be summarized with no critical analysis . If analysis is present it is over-simplified and incomplete .
B) organizational statement	Presents a clear and direct statement/framework located in the beginning of paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/issues. Readers should be able to anticipate how and why the paper will proceed as it does.	Presents a general statement /framework located in the beginning of the paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/ issues. Readers should be able to anticipate how the argument will proceed as it does, although reasons why may not be completely obvious but are generally implied.	Presents a vague or partial statement/framework located somewhere within the first few pages of the paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/issues. Readers may have to infer how the paper will proceed as it does, but may not find why it is organized. (5 paragraph theme—3 things in random order—automatic Adequate)	Presents no organizational statement/framework. Readers are not able to infer how and why the paper will proceed as it does.

ARGUMENT:*C) reasoning: depth and complexity of thought**D) evidence: data/quotations/visuals and counterarguments*

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
C) reasoning	Exhibits substantial depth, fullness, and complexity of thought supported by sophisticated ideas/analysis and carefully chosen evidence that support the paper's thesis and demonstrates substantial comprehension of material presented. Thinking expresses views without discriminatory, socially offensive, or illogical thinking.	Must exhibit a preponderance of depth, fullness, and complexity of thought ; though reasoning and evidence may not be uniformly conclusive and convincing. Demonstrates general comprehension of material presented. Thinking expresses views without discriminatory, socially offensive, or illogical thinking.	Exhibits very little depth, fullness, and complexity of thought ; a reasoned response, but the reasoning and presentation of evidence may be somewhat simplistic and/or repetitive. Demonstrates some comprehension of material presented. Thinking may express slightly discriminatory, socially offensive, and/or illogical views throughout the paper.	Exhibits no depth, fullness, and complexity of thought ; lacks clear reasoning, and supporting ideas, or evidence may be contradictory, repetitive, or inadequately linked to the thesis. Demonstrates little or no comprehension of material presented. Thinking is driven by discriminatory, socially offensive, and/or illogical views.
D) evidence	Seamlessly and appropriately incorporates and explains the accuracy and relevance of data/ quotations/paraphrases/visuals; offers evidence from a variety of sources, including counterarguments/contrary evidence. No evidence is perfunctory.	Incorporates appropriately and examines data/ quotations/paraphrases/ visuals; offers evidence from some sources, and may have counterarguments/ contrary evidence. Evidence is seldom perfunctory .	Incorporates data/ quotations/ paraphrases/visuals without much explanation, and offers limited evidence with no counterarguments/ contrary evidence. Evidence is typically perfunctory .	Fails to identify and/or include data//quotations/ paraphrases/visuals nor corresponding explanation , and fails to address counterarguments/ contrary evidence.

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE:*E) rhetorical structure: transitions, headers, bullets, and other structural indicators appropriate to the discipline*

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
E) rhetorical structure	The argument's focus is abundantly clear to the reader, and paragraphs logically and coherently build upon each other through the complete and fluent use of transitions and/or headings .	The argument's focus is generally clear to the reader and the use of transitions and/or headings lends a sense of progression and coherence. Not formulaic.	The argument's progression is unclear to the reader. Some, mostly formulaic , transitions and/or headings are used, providing little or no sense of direction.	Transitions, headings, and sense of progression are absent .

CONCLUSION:*F) implications and consequences: importance of claims and future possibilities in conclusion*

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
<i>F) Implications and consequences</i>	Offers a clear and varied reframing of argument. Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, consequences, and/or future research possibilities. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. No oversimplification present. Contributes new reflections or thinking.	Offers some nuanced restatement of argument. Identifies some implications, some consequences, and/or some future research possibilities. Considers some context, assumptions, data, or evidence. May offer one minor oversimplification , but contributes something new to the argument beyond restatement.	Simply restates argument with little or no reflection on implications or consequences. Rarely considers context, assumptions, data, or evidence. Often oversimplified and typically does not add anything new .	Offers a partial or poor restatement of argument. Fails to identify conclusions, implications or consequences. Does not consider context , assumptions, data, or evidence. Is oversimplified and usually incomplete with nothing new added.

DISCIPLINARY CONCERNS:*G) academic tone: specialized terms and concepts, formality/informality**H) disciplinary conventions: document format, including in-text citations, works cited, bibliography, references*

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
<i>G) academic tone</i>	Tone is mature, consistent , and suitable for topic and audience. Uses specialized terms accurately and consistently when appropriate.	Tone is usually appropriate; although there may be occasional lapses. Specialized terms usually used, often consistently , when appropriate.	Tone may have inconsistencies in tense and person; a pattern of lapses undermines the tone . Specialized terms, if present, are used superficially .	Tone is superficial and stereotypical ; oral rather than written language patterns predominate. Specialized terms, when present, are typically misused .
<i>H) disciplinary conventions</i>	Fully adheres to disciplinary conventions genre, format (including paragraphing, titles, identifying information), document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, and images. Cites and formats sources accurately and consistently and provides appropriate and complete works cited/ bibliography/ references and footnote/endnotes. One or two error patterns may be present.	Generally adheres to disciplinary conventions appropriate genre, format (including paragraphing, titles, identifying information), document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, and images. Cites and formats sources consistently and provides appropriate works cited/ bibliography/ references and footnote/ endnotes. Several errors or flaws are present.	Attempted, but awkward and inappropriate adherence to disciplinary genre, format (including paragraphing, titles, identifying information), document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, and images. Cites some sources but often inaccurately . May neglect to include works cited page or to cite some sources altogether. References typically present, but inaccurate .	Fails to adhere to disciplinary genre, format (including paragraphing, titles, identifying information), document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, images. Little or no use of citation formats.

GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX:

I) clarity: in sentence structure

J) style: sentence variety

K) mechanics: sentence-level patterns of error (e.g. comma splices, run-on sentences, subject/verb agreement)

	4. Extremely Effective	3. Effective	2. Adequate	1. Inadequate
<i>I) clarity</i>	Sentences consistently phrase thoughts clearly ; there may be a lapse or two in clarity.	Sentences usually phrase thoughts clearly . As a reader, I have to do some work to understand several sentences.	Sentences may, at times, be wordy and contain unclear phrasing and vocabulary . As a reader, I have to do too much work to understand sentences.	Sentences are frequently wordy and frequently contain unclear phrasing and vocabulary . As a reader, I can't typically follow what the writer is saying.
<i>J) style</i>	Sentences are varied, convincing, nuanced, and eloquent and rarely if ever simplistic.	Sentences are generally varied and convincing, although occasionally simplistic. May, at times, be nuanced and eloquent.	Sentences may not be varied or convincing. And are often simplistic. Language is not nuanced or eloquent, but it does not generally interfere with communication.	Sentences are not varied or convincing and are usually simplistic. Lack of eloquence or nuanced language generally interferes with communication.
<i>K) mechanics</i>	Contains virtually no sentence level errors. May have a few accidental errors and/or perhaps one error pattern that does not overwhelm the text	Contains infrequent sentence level errors; a few patterns of error may be present that do not overwhelm the text.	Contains wide range of errors, including several patterns that do not impede comprehension.	Contains consistent error patterns that impede comprehension and overwhelm the text.