|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***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 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 matter

Document 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 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 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 recs

Student 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 recs

Student 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 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 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: title, 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: title, header, spacing, indentation, bibliography 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 more than three of the following: title, header, spacing, indentation, bibliography page, formatted like the functional model)**
* No reference page
* No in-text citations
 |