

LO 1.1 - Read and write with a critical point of view that displays depth of thought and is mindful of the rhetorical situation of a specific discipline.					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
Evidence of depth of thought: Analysis/argument/ interpretation create a compelling position	Central purpose is well developed with an abundance of evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight. Appropriate for the discipline or genre.	Central idea is adequately developed with sufficient evidence and/or analysis. Evidence demonstrates some insight into the problem being explored. Appropriate for the discipline or genre.	Central idea is present, but inadequately developed or substantiated by evidence and/or analysis. Appropriate for the discipline or genre.	Central idea is poorly developed or absent. Not clearly connected to the discipline or genre.	
Use of genre and disciplinary conventions	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Follows some expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation. Use of disciplinary conventions is not always successful or apparent.	Does not follow genre or disciplinary conventions.	

LO 1.2 - Compose texts that demonstrate intellectual and creative rigor, engagement, and clear purpose (critical thinking, complexity, communication)					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
<p>Accurately, ethically, and persuasively synthesizing multiple perspectives (emphasizing complexity & critical thinking in view of AW's focus on discipline/field-informed writing and information literacy)</p> <p>Note: satisfying this LO can (and should) incorporate writers' own perspectives (via source selection and evaluation), but central to this LO is representing and relating the relevant ideas of others (i.e. sources). Sources can be either course texts (assigned readings, etc) or independently-selected texts.</p>	<p>Includes multiple outside perspectives/ideas (i.e. sources) relevant to the topic/project. Treats these ideas with sophistication, getting into their nuances/complexities and offering evaluation of them (either implicitly or explicitly) to indicate how valid the student finds the sources and positioning them relative to the purpose of the text. Outside sources construct a coherent overview/narrative demonstrating how these ideas are related to each other, giving the reader a clear & comprehensive sense of the existing conversation about the topic.</p>	<p>Includes multiple outside perspectives/ideas (i.e. sources) relevant to the topic/project. Treats these ideas with sophistication, getting into their nuances/complexities and offering evaluation of them (either implicitly or explicitly) to indicate how valid the student finds the sources and positioning them relative to the purpose of the text. Evidence that writer has integrated the sources.</p>	<p>Includes multiple sources but the coverage is simplistic and/or lacking in detail, failing to illustrate what each source adds to the existing conversation about the topic. Little evidence that writer is relating ideas to one another (i.e. source-based writing reads like an annotated bibliography in paragraph form).</p>	<p>May include outside sources, but their relevance to the topic is not clear, OR the number of sources (ideas/perspectives) is very limited or overly reliant on 1-2 sources, leading to a text that lacks rigor and</p>	

LO 1.3 Independently locate , deliberately select , and appropriately use and cite evidence that is ample, credible , and smoothly integrated into an intellectually honest text appropriate for a particular discipline (Complexity, Communication, Information Literacy)					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
Independently locate and deliberately select evidence	For assessment: Unless reflective statements about information literacy are systematically assigned and collected, this may be more apparent through syllabus review.				present/absent
Appropriately cite evidence	Attributes and cites all sources consistent with one style manual, appropriate for the modality, in-text and in the references	Attributes and cites most sources consistent with one style manual in text and in references	Attributes or cites some sources, with little consistency or regularity	No sources are cited in-text or in references	
Evidence is ample and credible	The writing includes a very high volume of reliable, authoritative and high quality evidence to support claims	The writing includes a moderate volume of reliable, authoritative and high quality evidence to support claims	The writing includes a low volume of evidence of reliable, authoritative and high quality evidence to support claims	The writing includes no reliable, authoritative and high quality evidence to support claims	
Evidence is smoothly integrated	Writing introduces, and explicates relevant primary data (eg. direct quotes, statistics)	Writing generally introduces, and explicates relevant primary data (eg. direct quotes, statistics)	Writing occasionally introduces and/or explicates relevant primary data (eg. direct quotes, statistics)	Writing never integrates evidence, or never introduces or explicates relevant primary data (eg. direct quotes, statistics)	
Uses of evidence are appropriate for a particular discipline	Selected evidence reflects genres appropriate to the discipline.	Sources include genres which are generally appropriate for the discipline.	Selected sources are generally inappropriate for the discipline.	Sources are absent or inappropriate for the discipline.	

Draft AW Scoring rubric

November 6, 2019

LO 1.4 Demonstrate an understanding of their writing processes as modes of learning and intentionally manipulate those processes in response to diverse tasks (Critical Thinking, Complexity, Intentional Learning) ASSESSMENT will include review of assignments/syllabi				
	From student's work	Present/Absent	From syllabus/assignments	P/A
Evidence that writing process is seen as a process of learning that can be manipulated in response to diverse tasks	Evidence of scaffolding, developing writing in stages using strategies such as pre-writing, proposals, annotated bibliographies, drafts. Work submitted may include multiple types of writing or a reflective piece.	Present/Absent	Evidence of scaffolding, and that student is developing writing in stages using strategies such as pre-writing, proposals, annotated bibliographies, drafts.	P/A

OVERALL Score and rationale					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
Overall, what rating would you this students' writing based on the work submitted for AW?					
Code up to 5 elements that most affect your overall rating. Use the numbers below to indicate your choices on the scoring sheet in the designated areas					
1. Evidence of depth of thought: Analysis/argument/ interpretation create a compelling position					
2. Use of genre and disciplinary conventions					
3. Accurately, ethically, and persuasively synthesizing multiple perspectives					
4. Independently locate and deliberately select evidence					
5. Appropriately cite evidence					
6. Evidence is ample and credible					
7. Evidence is smoothly integrated					
8. Uses of evidence are appropriate for a particular discipline					
9. Evidence that writing process is seen as a process of learning that can be manipulated in response to diverse tasks					
10. Other (open response)					