| Criterion | Exceeds expectations (excellently written) | Meets expectations (Pass) | Needs improvement (Fail) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Purpose** | Student understands the document's purpose • Understands the document's problem and prompt Student 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 prompt Student 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 prompt Student 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 organization Student 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 matter Document contains adequate factual support for recommendations, claims, or arguments | Contents lack logical organization and contain several logical missteps/fallacies Student 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 matter Document 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 recs Student uses a professional yet conversational tone; **no** slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargon • Doesn't use cliches, idioms, specialized language Student demonstrates an insightful level of cultural/global sensibility and awareness Style 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 recs Student uses a professional yet conversational tone; **scant (three or less)** instances of slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargon Student demonstrates an appropriate level of cultural/global sensibility and awareness Style 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 recs Student uses an unprofessional, chatty, or overly formal tone; instances of slang, jokes, or unnecessary jargon Student 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 people Style 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 reader In 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** • 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** • 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** • No reference page • No in-text citations |