

Discipline-General Standards for Writing Assessment

5 (Excellent)	4 (Good)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Inadequate)	1 (Poor)
CONTENT DEVELOPMENT				
<p>The paper presents a convincing and pointed response to the topic. It is clear, focused, and engaging. Support contains substantial consistently relevant details and reflects persuasive reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis is clearly and convincingly defined. • Supporting ideas are accurate, substantial, specific, and thorough. No extraneous material is present. • Ideas are original, perceptive, insightful, and persuasive. As a result, the paper commands strong reader attention. 	<p>The paper presents a thoughtful response to the topic. It is clear and focused. Support is appropriate and reflects sensible reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis is clearly defined. • Supporting ideas are substantial, appropriate, and relevant, but could be more fully developed. • Abrupt digression is rare. Even if so, it is not distracting and does not obscure the meaning at all. • Ideas are generally engaging and occasionally insightful and perceptive. As a result, the paper commands good reader attention. 	<p>The paper presents an adequate response to the topic. It is clear and focused, but may not be engaging. Support is generally adequate, though may be limited, incomplete, or occasionally digressive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis is defined, though may be somewhat weak or ineffective. It may be too broad, too narrow, or vague. • Support is generally sufficient, though may be occasionally sketchy, repetitive, irrelevant. • Occasionally, generalizations are not fully supported by the evidence given. • Ideas may tend to be somewhat mundane. As a result, the paper commands some reader attention. 	<p>The paper fails to address the topic. It may have a focus but lacks clarity. Support is incomplete and irrelevant. It lacks logical thought progression and shows serious errors in reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis is not apparent or very weak. • Support is incomplete, irrelevant, illogical, and inadequate. • Major assertions are not supported. • Ideas lack clarity and logical coherence. As a result, the paper commands minimal reader attention. 	<p>The paper is seriously flawed. It does not have a clear thesis and requires significant reader effort to make inferences based on sketchy and incoherent ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis is not defined. • Support is brief, vague, simplistic, incoherent, and inappropriate, constantly forcing the reader to make labored inferences based on very skimpy ideas. • The paper commands no reader attention.
ORGANIZATION				
<p>Organization is clear, efficient, and effective. It enhances the development of the central idea, smoothly moving the reader through the text with logical transitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is coherent and unified, showing a clear plan related to the thesis. • Ideas are logically developed. Topic sentences are clear and effective. • Research resources are effectively coordinated with each other, and material is effectively integrated into the body of the paper. • Introduction is clear and captures instant reader interest. • Conclusion is logical and comprehensive; it does more than merely summarize or restate, but clearly shows fulfillment of the purpose stipulated by the thesis. • Transition between paragraphs is smooth. No reader effort is required. 	<p>Organization is clear, transition is smooth, but structure is perhaps somewhat formulaic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is coherent and unified, showing a plan related to the thesis. • Ideas are well developed. Topic sentences are clearly identifiable. • Research resources are well coordinated with each other, and material is well integrated into the body of the paper. • Introduction is clear, and the thesis is clearly stated. • Conclusion may summarize the main points, but it leaves the reader with a sense of appropriate closure of the argument. • Transition between paragraphs is generally smooth, but the use of transitional expressions lacks variations. • Little reader effort is required to follow the line of discussion or argument. 	<p>Organization is present though at times difficult to follow due to occasional ineffective use of transitional expressions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is generally unified and coherent, or at least showing attempts to follow a plan related to the thesis. • Ideas are generally developed logically, but topic sentences are at times weak and ineffective. • Introduction is recognizable, though may not well crafted. • Conclusion may merely summarize or restate the main points, but it is clearly recognizable. • Transition is generally smooth. However, occasional omission or misuse of transitional expressions may cause the reader to pause to recover direction. 	<p>Organization is not logical. The reader often has difficulty following the ideas because of lapses in organization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is not unified and coherent, showing little attempt to follow a plan related to the thesis. • Introduction is vague and minimally recognizable. • Conclusion does not summarize, nor does it restate the main ideas. • Organization is barely identifiable. • Supporting details are not logically sequenced and arranged, constantly leaving the reader confused or confounded. • Frequent ineffective transitions not only leave connections between ideas unclear, but also interfere with the overall comprehensibility of the paper. 	<p>Organization is disjointed. The writing lacks direction. As a result, the reader has difficulty following the ideas and details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is not unified and coherent; it is underdeveloped or developed with irrelevance, redundancy, inconsistency, or little order or progression. • Introduction and conclusion are not clearly identifiable, nor is the organization of the body apparent. • Transitions are very weak, leaving connections between paragraphs and ideas confusing. • Lack of organization ultimately distorts the main idea.

5 (Excellent)	4 (Good)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Inadequate)	1 (Poor)
GRAMMAR				
<p>The paper displays consistent facility in the use of complex sentence structures, exhibits syntactic variety, and is essentially free from any syntactic errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentences are sophisticated, skillfully constructed, and effectively varied in structure and length. The paper is free from fragments and run-on sentences. Sentences are free from errors in coordinating and subordinating clauses, verb forms, tense sequencing, prepositions, articles, and nouns. 	<p>The paper displays facility in the use of sentence structures and shows appropriate syntactic variety. Occasional minor errors do not obscure meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentences are generally free from awkward constructions. Sentences are appropriately varied in structure and lengths. The paper may display occasional fragments and run-together sentences as well as occasional errors in clauses, verb forms, tense sequencing, prepositions, articles, and nouns. However, meaning is not obscured. 	<p>The paper display adequate but somewhat inconsistent facility with syntax. Some major and minor errors as well as awkward sentences may occasionally obscure meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentences are in general clearly and correctly constructed with some variety. The paper may display some fragments and run-together sentences. Some major errors in clauses, verb forms, and verb sequencing as well as minor errors in prepositions, articles, and nouns cause the reader to pause and reread. 	<p>The paper displays inadequate facility with syntax. Frequent major and minor errors as well as awkward sentences obscure meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentences are marred with many fragments and run-together sentences as well as frequent errors in verb forms, tense sequencing, prepositions, articles, and nouns. Sentences display little variety in structure and length. Frequent serious errors so interfere with the overall comprehensibility of the paper that reader effort is constantly frustrated. 	<p>The paper displays poor control of syntax. Severe and frequent errors frustrate the reader.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous sentences are disjointed, awkward, incomplete, or nonsensical. Severe grammar errors obscure meaning despite significant reader effort. Sentences are monotonous, simplistic, and repetitive in the subject-verb and subject-verb-object patterns.
WORD CHOICE				
<p>Word choice is distinctive. The intended message is conveyed in a fresh, precise, and engaging manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary use is precise, specific, formal, accurate, and colorful. Vocabulary may be at times striking, but it is natural and never overdone. Slang and informal conversational expressions are not used. 	<p>Word choice is clear. The intended message it conveyed. Occasional minor errors in word form and weakness in word choice do not obscure meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary use is clear and accurate. Word choice may be occasionally inaccurate or imprecise, but it does not interfere with the general comprehensibility of the text. Slang and informal conversational expressions are rarely used. 	<p>Word choice is substantially ordinary, but it conveys the message. Inaccurate, imprecise, and inappropriate vocabulary may occasionally obscure meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word choice is somewhat dull and repetitive though at times fine and skillful; attempts at colorful language may be overdone. Slang is occasionally used. Occasional incorrect or imprecise vocabulary may cause the reader to slow down and reread. 	<p>Word choice is unacceptable. Frequent inaccurate, imprecise, inappropriate vocabulary use obscures meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary is limited Word choice is dull with frequent use of clichés, redundancies, and trite or hackneyed phrases. Slang is frequently used. Frequently inaccurate, imprecise, inappropriate, and unidiomatic word choice frustrates the reader. 	<p>Word choice is consistently poor. No intended message is conveyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Words are consistently dull or monotonously repetitive. Constant imprecise, inaccurate, inappropriate, and unidiomatic word choice severely distorts or obscures meaning. Slang and informal conversational vocabulary is overused.
PUNCTUATION AND MECHANICS				
<p>Clarity is enhanced with consistent use of standard punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Errors are few and minor; only light editing is needed to polish the text.</p>	<p>Clarity is generally maintained by accurate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The flow of communication is not diverted by occasional minor errors in punctuation and mechanics.</p>	<p>Clarity is somewhat weakened by occasional incorrect use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Errors may be distracting, and meaning is occasionally obscured.</p>	<p>Clarity and effectiveness is frequently marred with major errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The reader has to make labored attempts to make sense of the text.</p>	<p>Communication is consistently hindered by numerous errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The reader is overwhelmed and finds it difficult to focus on the text.</p>

Optional Discipline-Specific Standards for Writing Assessment

5 (Excellent)	4 (Good)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Inadequate)	1 (Poor)
RESEARCH AND CITATIONS				
<p>The paper consistently integrates a significant number of reference sources in discussion. Also, the paper consistently observes the selected citation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites more than 10-12 reference sources. Both current and classic sources are effectively used. • Research sources must be from books or major articles from academic peer-reviewed journals, either in hard copies or online. Non-academic sources may be used as deemed appropriate by the department. • The paper consistently follows the citation style appropriate to the discipline. Only light editing may be needed. 	<p>The paper integrates slightly more than the required number of reference sources. Also, the paper generally observes the selected citation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites a minimum of 10-12 reference sources. Both current and classic sources are well used. • Only a few sources may be non-academic, such as major news magazines or review periodicals. • The paper generally follows the citation style appropriate to the discipline. Light editing may be needed. 	<p>The paper integrates a minimum number of reference sources in discussion. Also, the paper occasionally fails to observe the selected citation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites only 10-12 reference sources. Both current and classic sources are adequately used. • A larger proportion of popular press sources are used. Many are minor articles. • The paper occasionally fails to follow the citation style appropriate to the discipline. Some editing is needed. 	<p>The paper integrates in discussion a number of reference sources slightly less than required. Also, the paper frequently fails to follow the selected citation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites slightly fewer than 10-12 reference sources. Both current and classic sources are inadequately used. • The majority of the sources are of the popular nature, and many are minor articles. • The paper frequently fails to follow the citation style appropriate to the discipline. Significant editing is needed. 	<p>The paper integrates a significantly small number of reference sources in discussion, far less than the required. Also, the paper shows no reader awareness of the need to observe the selected citation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper cites fewer than 10-12 reference sources. Both current and classic sources are poorly used. • Almost all of the sources are of the popular nature and are minor articles. • No bibliography or works cited are included. • The paper consistently fails to follow the citation style. Major revision is needed.
INTEGRATION OF THEOLOGY				
<p>The paper consistently integrates the Christian faith in discussion of the topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writer extensively discusses the moral and spiritual ramifications of the thesis. • Spiritual ramifications of the thesis should be organic to the essay, not simply tacked on as an addendum. • The writer cites Scripture and/or Christian writers effectively to support the discussion. • Insightful theological observation, critical analysis, and practical application are demonstrated. 	<p>The paper well integrates the Christian faith in discussion of the topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writer well discusses the moral and spiritual ramifications of the thesis. • The writer cites Scripture and/or Christian writers well to support the discussion. • Good theological observation, analysis, and application are provided. 	<p>The paper adequately integrates the Christian faith in discussion of the topic, although marginally at times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writer adequately discusses the moral and spiritual ramifications of the thesis. • The writer cites Scripture and/or Christian writers appropriately to support the discussion. • Adequate theological observation, analysis, and application are provided. 	<p>The paper only occasionally integrates the Christian faith in discussion of the topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writer only occasionally discusses the moral and spiritual ramifications of the thesis. • The paper shows minimal attempt to cite Scripture and/or Christian writers to support the discussion. • Minimal theological observation, analysis, and application are provided. 	<p>The paper fails to integrate the Christian faith in discussion of the topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper exhibits no theological reflection in the discussion of the topic. • No theological observation, analysis, and application are provided.