|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criterion*** | **Exceeds expectations (excellently written)** | **Meets expectations (Pass)** | **Needs improvement (Fail)** |
| **Purpose**  | Student understands the document’s purpose• Understands the document's problem and promptStudent demonstrates a clear understanding of the assignment and its major aspects; critical thinking of the assignment and its major concerns is evident• Gives two recs (no more or less)• Recs address the main problem of the prompt | Student mostly understands the document’s problem and promptStudent generally understands the assignment and its major aspects; critical thinking of its major concerns is mostly evident• Gives two recs (could give more that fall under the same rec category)• Recs mostly address the main problem of the prompt | Student doesn't understand the document’s problem and promptStudent has a poor grasp of the case and its major aspects; document does not demonstrate sufficient levels of critical thinking of its major problems/concerns• Less than two recs are given or more than three that don’t fall under same rec category• Recs don’t address the main problem of the prompt |
| **Content & Organization of Ideas**  | Contents have a clear, logical, and compelling organizationStudent synthesizes information into a coherent, plausible analysis • Student integrates, synthesizes, and analyzes **four sources**• Makes obvious why sources are included and matter Document contains compelling, credible, authoritative factual support for all recommendations, claims, or arguments | Contents are logically organized; may possess a minor logical misstep/fallacy Student mostly synthesizes information into a coherent, plausible analysis • Mostly integrates, synthesizes, and analyzes **at least three** sources• Attempt to explain why sources are included and matterDocument contains adequate factual support for recommendations, claims, or arguments | Contents lack logical organization and contain several logical missteps/fallaciesStudent generally fails to synthesize information into a coherent, plausible analysis • Doesn’t integrate, synthesize, or analyze **at least three sources**• Doesn’t make obvious why sources are included and matterDocument lacks factual support for its recommendations, claims, or arguments  |
| **Audience: Professionalism, Style, &Tone** | Student addresses audience’s needs and expectations for the document• Relates evidence completely back to audience• Gives specific and tangible actions for the recsStudent uses a professional yet conversational tone; **no** slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargon• Doesn't use cliches, idioms, specialized languageStudent demonstrates an insightful level of cultural/global sensibility and awarenessStyle is appropriate *and* engaging; uses concise phrasing and precise language. It is easy *and* enjoyable to read | Student mostly addresses audience’s needs and expectations for the document• Mostly relates evidence back to audience• Gives a few tangible and specific actions for the recsStudent uses a professional yet conversational tone; **scant** **(three or less)** instances of slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargonStudent demonstrates an appropriate level of cultural/global sensibility and awarenessStyle is appropriate but not as engaging as could be; some wordiness or indirect language | Student does not address audience’s needs and expectations for the document• Doesn't relate evidence back to audience• Gives no tangible and specific actions for the recsStudent uses an unprofessional, chatty, or overly formal tone; instances of slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargonStudent lacks sufficient level of cultural/global sensibility and awareness• Tone is bossy and demanding; for example, uses at least four tonally inappropriate words like “have to,” “must,” “need,” • Paper generalizes about groups of peopleStyle is inappropriate and/or dull; wordy phrasing or indirect language |
| **Grammar & Punctuation** | Document contains **one or less**spelling, grammar, punctuation, or word choice errors In short, the writer’s credibility would *increase* because of the document’s precision and freedom of errors; the average reader could scan the document quickly and still understand its contents | Document may contain **some minor** errors, but not enough to distract the average reader In short, the writer’s credibility would not be harmed because of these minor errors; the average reader would have no trouble understanding contents on the first read-through | Document contains errors that would distract the average reader *or* make comprehension difficult for the average readerIn short, the writer’s credibility would diminish because of the multitude of errors and difficulty readers have with the document |
| **Genre conventions & Format** | Document follows the format given in the assignment prompt**• Complete all the following: header, spacing, indentation, bibliography page, formatted like functional model, follows length requirement**• Contains a reference page *and* all sources are cited correctly per the formatting guidelines given in the assignment prompt; contains correct parenthetical citations or footnotes | Document follows the format given in the assignment prompt**• Miss less than three of the following: header, spacing, indentation, references page, formatted like the functional model, follows length requirement**• Has in-text citations and reference page but not in the correct format | Document fails to follow the format given in the assignment prompt**• Miss three or more of the following: header, spacing, indentation, bibliography page, formatted like the functional model, follows length requirement**• No reference page• No in-text citations |