

Scoring Rubric—Graduate Writing Requirement, MA in Communication

Scoring Level	Style, Format, & Documentation	Writing Mechanics	Content	Organization
5= Exemplary	In addition to meeting the requirement for a "4," the paper employs the conventions for style, documentation, and format, appropriate to the selected guide, without error.. The reader would have no difficulty referring back to cited sources. The manuscript would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in a peer-reviewed journal in a related area of the discipline..	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," the paper is essentially error-free in terms of mechanics. Reads like a final, polished draft.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," excels in the presenting ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas, and would serve as a solid foundation for further research on the topic. The paper provides a superior introduction to the topic and disciplinary literature.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," excels in the organization of ideas at all levels. Transitions and organization of points effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.
4=Accomplished	Although it may contain minor errors the paper employs conventions for style, documentation, and format, appropriate to the selected guide, consistently throughout. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.	Although it may contain minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Selects effective vocabulary and terms. Reads like a revised draft.	Engages with relevant disciplinary literature. Ideas are expanded upon in a creative and innovative manner. The paper provides a proficient introduction to the topic.	Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic, sub-points are easy to identify, and transitions move the argument forward. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument.
3=Competent	The style, documentation, and format, appropriate to the selected guide, are broadly followed, but a few inconsistencies may appear. Relies upon less suitable sources (non-peer-reviewed literature, encyclopedias). The style or format may be difficult to follow.	Grammatical and spelling conventions are generally employed, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. Most vocabulary and terms are used appropriately, although there may be minor errors. Draft would benefit from some revision.	Ideas presented closely discuss existing concepts with little expansion or development of new directions. Engages with a reasonable amount of disciplinary literature. Ideas and concepts are satisfactorily presented, although occasional lapses in logic may appear. The paper provides a suitable introduction to the topic.	Ideas and concepts are satisfactorily grouped, although lapses in organization are apparent. The main points are clear, but sub-points may not be identified clearly enough to keep the reader on track. Transitions are present.
2=Developing	Although some of the style, documentation and format conventions, appropriate to the selected guide, are followed, many are not. Paper lacks consistency of style, documentation, and/or format. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. The style or format may detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense shifts), sentence structure, and/or other composition conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is confusion in the proper use of vocabulary and terms. Draft requires moderate revision.	The paper is thematically coherent but the content is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major disciplinary ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. The paper provides an incomplete introduction to the topic.	The paper is logically coherent but is lacking organization and/or focus in a number of ways. The main points may not always be clear, sub-points may not be identified clearly enough to keep the reader on track, and/or transitions may be unclear or inconsistent.
1=Beginning	The style, format, and/or documentation conventions of the selected guide are not followed. Fails to demonstrate consistency in documentation. Inappropriate style and/or format interfere with comprehensibility.	Paper contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, sentence structure, or vocabulary, making the logic of the paper extremely difficult to follow. Draft requires substantial revision.	Engagement with existing disciplinary literature on the topic is inadequate. Content lacks focus and cohesion. The paper offers little information about or demonstrates little understanding of the topic. The paper provides an inadequate introduction to the topic.	Paper lacks organization and focus. There is great difficulty in identifying the main points of the paper as well as the sub-points. Transitions are not present. The ideas are scattered.