

Writing Competency Rubric Evaluation Criteria					
Outcomes	Advanced 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Minimal 1	Not Evident/Deficient 0
<p>1. Central or Controlling Idea Presents a clear and focused central idea (a.k.a. thesis) that moves beyond general themes, clichés, and common knowledge while corresponding to the requirements of the writing task.</p>	Central idea is perceptive, demonstrable, and maintained throughout, revealing robust and nuanced understanding--engaged thought in regard to the writing task.	Central idea is a clear, thoughtful, appropriate response to the writing task, demonstrating solid understanding.	Central idea is perfunctory: perhaps a general theme that shows some understanding but modest to little engagement with the task at hand.	Central idea is unclear or absent, perhaps not demonstrable, and perhaps not well-connected to the writing task. Reflects little understanding.	No evidence of a central idea.
<p>2. Organization Purposefully advances the central idea by the selection and arrangement of ideas coupled with the skillful use of transitions to create document and paragraph level coherence.</p>	Clear, coherent structure with evidence of deliberate, original planning for the assigned task. Consistent, effective transitions. No significant lapses in overall cohesion.	Evidence of thoughtful planning appropriate to the writing task; easy to follow with some effective transitions.	A mechanical organization. Lack of smooth transitions distract from a unified coherence.	The sequence of ideas is difficult to follow—apparently patterned on the writer’s idiosyncratic thought processes--with few, if any, cues for comprehension.	No apparent organizational pattern.
<p>3. Development Primary and secondary source materials are applied in a sound and credible way to extend support and explain presented ideas and/or arguments.</p>	Key points are fully, specifically, and effectively supported with a variety of credible materials. Sources are well-chosen, well-contextualized, and mindfully synthesized for the writing task--and correctly cited.	Main points are supported with appropriate material. Sources are reasonably framed, synthesized, and explicated; nearly all sources are cited.	Support is general with an adequate mix of materials. Resource materials are not fully explained and not carefully contextualized in relation to the central idea—limited synthesis. Some citations may require clarification.	Thin explanation. Little of the evidence and explanation used supports the central idea. Resource materials are neither contextualized nor explicated. Citation is problematic.	Supporting materials and/or citations are absent.
<p>4. Mechanics Applies the spelling, grammar, usage, punctuation, documentation style, and disciplinary conventions appropriate for the particular task.</p>	No distracting spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors; quotations and/or secondary source materials are all correctly cited.	Few distracting spelling, punctuation, and/or grammatical errors; quotations and/or secondary source materials are correctly cited.	Some distracting spelling, punctuation, and/or grammatical errors; some quotations and/or secondary source materials are not correctly cited.	Significant and distracting spelling, punctuation, and/or grammatical errors; quotations and/or secondary source materials are incorrectly cited or lacking citations.	Consistent patterns of errors and evident failure to grasp rules of language and disciplinary conventions. No citations for quotations and/or secondary source materials.
<p>5. Style The varied use of sentence structure and careful choice of language helps to emphasize key ideas and create an appropriate tone for the writing task.</p>	Sentences are noticeably original, vivid, and well-constructed—effectively suited to the rhetorical context. Vocabulary is precise and thoughtfully chosen. A distinct author’s voice is evident in the sentence formation and choice of words.	Language is clear, thoughtfully expressed, and appropriate for the task at hand. Meaning may be discerned with little effort.	Sentences are adequate for the writing assignment, but with little variation in construction. Language choices are sometimes inadvertent and inappropriate to the writing task--and may be confusing.	Sentence structure, word order, and word choice are confusing and consistently undercut the writing task and its rhetorical context.	Sentence structure includes significant errors and technical missteps that lead to confusion. Language choices and tone evoked are in conflict with the intended aim of the writing task.
<p>6. Audience Awareness Demonstrates deliberate consideration of the readers’ needs, provides sufficient information necessary for understanding, and creates a connection with readers through diction, development, and document design.</p>	Pointedly, thoughtfully engaging: speaks specifically and originally to readers’ needs and concerns, given the situation. Document exhibits purposeful design elements—for example, graphs, typesetting, and headings—relevant for the particular audience.	Reveals awareness of a real audience and its distinctive needs, demonstrating reader accommodation in deliberate document development, design, and articulation.	Limited content development, design, and articulation--with little attention to connecting with readers.	Document speaks strictly from the writer’s perspective, demonstrating little to no consideration for readers’ existences.	No awareness of audience evident in rhetorical choices or significant and disabling disparity between audience invoked and rhetorical choices selected.