

Rubric: Writing – Undergraduate

Name: _____ Date: _____

Instructor/Rater: _____ Rating Total: _____

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Below Expectations 2	Meets Expectations 3	Above Expectations 4	Outstanding 5	Score
Organization of the Paper: A. Organization.	Paper disorganized; information is hard to follow.	Some organization but jumps around. Vague sections showing opening, middle, and conclusions.	Organization is logical and generally clear. Conclusions are presented.	Opening, middle, and conclusion are identifiable. Well organized, easy to follow, logical.	Strong opening, supporting middle, and a strong conclusion; well organized, easy to follow.	
B. Writing Style.	Writing style is too “friendly” (reflects conversation not a formal paper). Sentence structure is poor; too many short or run-on sentences. Lacks clarity.	Sentences sometimes awkward, run-on, fragments, and dull. Yet, presentation is consistent. Too “friendly” in writing; as in conversation.	Sentences are well-constructed; generally clear/concise, sometimes offer redundant information. Sometimes “friendly” as in conversation.	Writing style is uniform and professional throughout. Sentences are generally well-constructed.	Writing style is uniform and professional throughout. Sentences are clear, complete, interesting, and concise.	
C. Word Use.	Words used incorrectly; words tend to be simple and unsophisticated; repetition.	Words are often uninspiring or dull and sometimes used without definition or meaning.	Adequate, but need to improve generally in the choice of words.	The words within the paper follow naturally, are varied and vivid. At times word choice is too simple or too complicated.	Words follow naturally, are varied and vivid. Words are sophisticated and reflect the topic.	
D. Grammar, diction, sentence structure, or spelling errors.	Multiple errors in grammar, diction, sentence structure, or spelling – must be redone.	There is more than one spelling or grammatical error per page; enough to distract the reader.	There are few spelling and grammatical errors.	Generally, the paper consists of correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	The paper has been proof-read and checked. There are no errors.	
Clarity of Analysis: A. Analysis and Research.	Analysis is not logical. Creditable research is lacking. Logic of analysis is difficult to follow; analysis is incomplete.	Analysis is light, bordering on superficial. Logic of analysis is sometimes difficult to follow; more research is needed.	Analysis is logical; top level with minimal depth of analysis. It is easy to follow; includes appropriate research methods and references.	Analysis is clearly and concisely described and is based on appropriate research. It is easy to follow and is strongly supported with sound evidence and documentation.	Analysis includes sophisticated research methods and clear results. There is logical progression to conclusions. Much support per well-researched evidence & documentation.	

Knowledge of the Subject: A. Facts, Details, and Analysis.	Inappropriate or insufficient details to support ideas; significant deficiencies in facts and analysis.	Paper includes irrelevant facts or too few needed facts.	Analysis is balanced with adequate level of factual presentation.	Paper has sufficient facts to support research, analysis, and conclusions.	Paper demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the appropriate inclusion of pertinent facts and analysis.	
B. Value of Information.	Makes little or no attempt to determine whether information is credible and/or relevant, or totally misjudges the relevance and credibility of information.	Makes a good attempt to determine whether information is credible and relevant to the task; some errors are made.	Actually determines whether information is credible and relevant to a specific task.	Analyzes information in detail. Accurately articulates and demonstrates credibility and relevance.	Includes directly relevant information. Information provided supports a credible analysis. No extraneous data/information is included.	
C. Interpreting Information and Synthesis.	Grossly misinterprets the information gathered or fails to synthesize it correctly.	Makes some errors in interpreting the information or synthesizes it somewhat imprecisely.	Accurately interprets information and concisely synthesizes it.	Interprets information gathered accurately and shows some insight into the interpretation.	Interprets information gathered accurately and is very insightful in interpreting it.	
D. Understanding of Subject.	Does not demonstrate understanding of topic beyond a surface level; little evidence of background work in facts. Little thought given to relating topic to course subject.	Demonstrates some understanding of the topic, but does not always make connections among ideas.	Demonstrates some understanding of the topic; makes adequate connections among ideas.	Moves beyond surface understanding and demonstrates facility with topical and disciplinary knowledge.	Significant evidence of background work in facts, theory, and related research. Much thought given to relating topic to course subject. Shows depth of understanding about the subject.	
Conclusions Reached:	None, or summary is cursory; is not carefully related to subject.	A conclusion is made from the evidence offered and states implications in terms of course subject, but is cursory and/or is minimal.	Some thoughtful conclusions are reached from the evidence offered; shows some understanding of implications for the field.	Several thoughtful conclusions are reached from the evidence offered; clear/insightful understanding of the meaning of the results for the field.	Numerous, detailed conclusions are reached from the evidence offered and show sophisticated understanding of the meaning of the results for the field.	

Reviewed: 12 November 2012

To be used for Reporting in PDII class but available to all professors wishing to assess Written Communication.