Foundational Rubric for Faculty Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum Courses at AUS

The writing assignment rubric below has been created in Fall 2012 by a faculty Writing Across the Curriculum Committee to accommodate a variety of formal or lengthier writing assignments that comprise research and analysis. This rubric is being offered as a template for you to adjust as needed.

To make optimal use of the rubric, you are encouraged to examine the categories and descriptors carefully, and to decide which of these are applicable to your written assignment. Please read the following guidelines, which identify the different options for tailoring this rubric to your assignment.

Grading Scale: This scale, found in the heading across the top, provides three options for titling the four levels of achievement in each category—letter grades, percentages and expectation level. Feel free to eliminate any option that does not suit your needs and, if keeping the percentages, to adjust them to your specifications.

Grading Categories: The rubric breaks written assignment grading into the following categories: Structure, Content—both fact-based and analytical, Style and Documentation. To make optimal use of the rubric, examine each category with their four achievement levels and related descriptors, and, according to the requirements of your assignment, adjust them in any way you see fit. You can eliminate and alter categories or descriptors—or create new ones—to fit your assignment specifications and goals.

Notice, each category contains a bolded descriptor **"Discipline-related criteria provided by professor"** to encourage you to create and add additional descriptors as needed.

Also, below the heading of each category in the right margin is the word "(weight)." It is up to you to determine the weight of each category.

It is a helpful practice to review your rubric with your students as you introduce your writing assignment so students have more insight into your expectations. You may consider posting your rubric on iLearn, so students can review the categories as they evaluate and proofread their own work prior to submission.

Foundational Rubric	A 100-90% Above expectations	B 89-80% Meets expectations	C 79-70% Meets expectations	D / F 69% and below Below expectations	Score
Structure (weight)	- Introductory section concisely highlights main points and logically leads to thesis / hypothesis - Thesis / hypothesis is obvious, well-articulated and concise, and is clearly supported by the entire text - Text contains highly effective paragraph structure with topic sentences clearly linked to thesis / hypothesis; very smooth transition between sentences and paragraphs - Facts are arranged or synthesized logically - Concluding section elegantly restates the thesis / hypothesis and contains a clear and smooth summary of main points presented; results are well considered in light of previous research; thoughtful and expansive application of thesis / hypothesis is provided **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	- Introductory section highlights main points and logically leads to thesis / hypothesis - Thesis / hypothesis is clear and concise and is supported by the entire text - Text contains effective paragraph structure with topic sentences linked to thesis / hypothesis; generally smooth transition between sentences and paragraphs - Facts are arranged or synthesized logically - Concluding section restates the thesis / hypothesis and contains a clear and smooth summary of main points presented; results are considered in light of previous research; thoughtful application of thesis / hypothesis is provided **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	- Introductory section presents main points that may be too detailed or not sufficiently explained, or not obviously linked to thesis / hypothesis - Thesis / hypothesis is unclear or is loosely related to the text - Text is occasionally challenged by poor flow or logic gaps: paragraph structure weak in places with ineffective topic sentences; rather choppy transition between sentences and paragraphs - Facts are generally arranged or synthesized logically - Concluding section restates the thesis / hypothesis in an unclear manner; summary of main points vague or incomplete; results are considered but not in light of previous research application of thesis / hypothesis is basic; may contain tangential or new information **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	- Introductory section does not clearly present main points of the essay / report - Thesis / hypothesis expresses a simple or obvious idea or may be vague or unrelated to parts of the text - Text is characterized by choppy flow and logic gaps between sentences and paragraphs - Facts are not arranged or synthesized logically - Concluding section does not restate the thesis / hypothesis in an unclear manner; summary of main points not presented or incomplete; results are not considered in light of previous research; application of thesis / hypothesis is weak or non-existent **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	**Score**

Content *Fact Base including background* (weight)					Score
	▪ Facts are of sufficient number to provide highly effective support ▪ Facts are consistently detailed, precise, and relevant ▪ Facts support the purpose or argument ▪ Facts are supported by a variety of quality sources as per discipline-specific criteria; attribution to sources is clear, fairly represented, and elegantly integrated ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Facts are sufficient to provide effective support ▪ Facts are generally detailed, precise, and relevant ▪ Facts support the purpose or argument ▪ Facts are supported by a variety of quality sources as per discipline-specific criteria; attribution to sources is clear, fairly represented, and effectively integrated ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Facts provide support although not always effectively ▪ Facts may often not be detailed, precise, or sufficiently relevant ▪ Facts usually support the purpose or argument ▪ Facts are supported by a variety of quality sources as per discipline-specific criteria; attribution to sources may not always be clear, fairly represented, or effectively integrated ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Very few facts provide support or require much more detail, precision or relevance to support the purpose or argument ▪ Facts are not arranged or synthesized logically and fail to support the argument ▪ A limited variety of sources are used; attribution to sources is minimal or ineffectively integrated ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	
Content *Substantive or In-depth Analysis* (weight)	▪ Facts are consistently linked to thesis with highly effective explanations ▪ Discussion or analysis demonstrates critical thinking and insight or appropriate methodological plan and implementation with clear analytic strategy ▪ In-depth understanding of topic demonstrated; discussion / analysis offers a compelling argument, case or solution, and brings reader to an understanding and appreciation of the topic ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Facts are linked to thesis with effective explanations ▪ Discussion or analysis demonstrates critical thinking or appropriate methodology and analytic strategy ▪ Solid understanding of topic demonstrated; additional analysis / discussion in places would strengthen arguments, case or solution, and bring reader to a better understanding of and interest in the topic ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Facts may not be consistently linked with thesis or may not provide effective explanations ▪ Discussion or analysis demonstrates marginal critical thinking; facts may appear to be "listed" and not integrated; method is somewhat dissociated from hypothesis and analytic strategy is unclear ▪ General understanding of topic demonstrated; additional analysis / discussion would strengthen arguments, case or solution, and bring reader to a better understanding of and interest in the topic ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	▪ Facts may not be consistently linked with thesis or may not provide effective explanations ▪ Discussion or analysis does not demonstrate critical thinking; method is dissociated from hypothesis and analytic strategy is poorly explained ▪ An understanding of the topic appears basic; considerably more explanation of facts is needed; reader feels confused or completely disinterested ▪ **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	Score

Style (weight)	• Word choice, spelling and grammar are consistently precise and accurate • Sentences vary in length and complexity; vocabulary is discipline-oriented and sophisticated; ideas are well expressed • Text is extremely interesting and clearly demonstrates effort and intellectual engagement • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Word choice, spelling and grammar are generally precise and accurate • Sentences vary in length and structure; vocabulary is discipline-oriented; ideas are fairly well expressed • Text is interesting and demonstrates effort and intellectual engagement • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Word choice, spelling and grammar require some attention • Some sentences are awkwardly constructed; vocabulary is somewhat basic and may not reflect a discipline-orientation; ideas are reasonably expressed • Text is generally interesting and reflects reasonable effort and engagement • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Word choice, spelling and grammar require considerable attention • Sentences are awkwardly constructed; vocabulary is basic and does not reflect knowledge of discipline discourse; expression is poor or unclear • Text is uninteresting and does not reflect effort or engagement • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	**Score**
Documentation (weight)	• Strict attention to details of discipline-specific documentation style within the text and bibliography • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Good attention to details of discipline-specific documentation style within the text and bibliography • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Some obvious and distracting errors in discipline-specific documentation style within the text and bibliography • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	• Limited or no attention to details of discipline-specific documentation style within the text and bibliography • **Discipline-related criteria provided by professor**	**Score**

Total Score _____