<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication and Critical Thinking Rubric and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Context of and Purpose for Writing**
Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s). | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 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**
Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms | 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. |
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