

Written Communication and Critical Thinking Rubric and Outcomes

	4	3	2	1
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience). Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.	Demonstrates general incoherence: purpose and focus are not clear or are inappropriate for audience and task.
Genre and Task Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a range of conventions particular to the writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to the writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. (May ignore adaptations to the writing task(s).)	No discernible pattern of organization is apparent.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates consistent use of relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the rhetorical context. Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints from sources are subject to questioning.	Demonstrates an attempt to use relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the rhetorical context. Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints from sources are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints from sources are taken as fact, without question.	Too little information is given to achieve the writer's purpose, or the writing is a jumble of facts which do not support a single purpose or thesis.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.	Specific position is not clear; writing launches into another subject or purpose unrelated to the task.