LO 1.1 – Elements (if multiple pieces of work are submitted and not all is relevant to each assignment, use the scores from the most appropriate work)					
Read and analyze texts for audience, speaker/writer, purpose, message, and context	**LO 1.1a shows awareness of source texts' AUDIENCE(S)** (e.g., To whom is the author writing/speaking? What values does the audience hold that the author or speaker appeals to?)	**LO 1.1b shows awareness of source texts' AUTHOR(S) /SPEAKER(S)** (e.g., Who is author? How does author establish credibility, authority?)	**LO 1.1c shows awareness of source texts' PURPOSE** (e.g., To what end is the author writing or speaking? What is the author's intention?)	**LO 1.1d shows awareness of source texts' RHETORICAL STRATEGIES** (e.g., How does the author support his or her position with reasons and evidence? What are the principal lines of reasoning or kinds of arguments used? How does the author or speaker appeal to reason? to emotion?	**LO 1.1e shows awareness of source texts' CONTEXT** (e.g., How do allusions, historical or cultural references, or kinds of words used place this in a certain time and location?
Identify if each element is present (0 = no, 1 = yes)					

LO 1.1-O – Overall Score for most relevant CTW1 work submitted						
	Highest -4	**Middle high-3**	**Middle low-2**	**Lowest-1**	**Not applicable/ Not present**	**Score**
LO 1.1 Overall RHETORICAL ANALYSIS: Read and analyze texts for audience, speaker/writer, purpose, message, and context	Work provides substantial evidence of the ability to analyze all elements of the rhetorical situation: intended audience, source/ author, purpose, context, and strategies for message construction	Work generally provides evidence to ability to analyze most elements of the rhetorical situation: identify intended audience, source/author, purpose, context, and strategies for message construction. Writing may be more attentive to some elements than others.	Work provides some evidence or ability to analyze most elements of the rhetorical situation: but analysis of intended audience, source/author, purpose, context, and strategies for message construction may be inconsistently applied or addressed.	Work provides little evidence of the ability to identify intended audience, author/source, purpose, context, and strategies for message construction.	Work does not provide any evidence of the ability to identify intended audience, author's purpose, context, and strategies for message construction.	

LO 1.2 - COMPOSE RHETORICALLY EFFECTIVE TEXTS: Compose rhetorically effective texts tailored to specific audiences and modes of presentations					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
LO 1.2a Issue question/problem/motive for text/"argument" (Purpose)	Reader can easily understand the main idea (e.g. thesis, focus, research question). The purpose is clear (what "problem" the writer is addressing and what issues motivate the evidence and analysis throughout).	Reader can understand the main idea (e.g. thesis, focus, research question). The purpose is somewhat clear (what "problem" the writer is addressing and what issues motivate the evidence and analysis throughout).	Reader can understand the main idea, but the purpose is not clear (what "problem" is being addressed, or what issues motivate the writer's use of evidence/analysis.)	The purpose is not clear (what the focus or main idea of the essay is or what problem is being addressed).	
LO 1.2b Analysis/argument/ interpretation create a compelling position	Central idea is well developed with an abundance of evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight.	Central idea is adequately developed with sufficient evidence and/or analysis. Evidence demonstrates some insight into the problem being explored.	Central idea is present, but inadequately developed or substantiated by evidence and/or analysis	Central idea is poorly developed or absent.	
LO 1.2c Organization, flow of thought, transitions	The text's organization is clear (and appropriate for the genre) and helps readers to determine the writer's purpose and focus. Clear transitions or signposts help readers follow the flow. The main components of the text convincingly relate to and build on one another. Readers do not need to reread sections and are not forced to wonder why certain ideas are incorporated or how they pertain to the text overall.	Text's organization is generally effective (and appropriate for the genre), and includes some elements or signposts which help guide readers. The main components of the text relate to and build on one another.	Text's organization is generally ineffective, and includes few elements or signposts which help guide readers. The main components of the text relate to one another, but may not be clear on how they build on one another.	The text lacks clear organization.	
LO 1.2d Style (diction, tone/register, consistency), formatting, presentation are appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion	Demonstrates the ability to use and modify style so as to make the text appropriate for a given audience, purpose, and/or occasion. Stylistic choices are employed purposefully so that the text is appropriate for intended readers/audience, the purpose, and the occasion.	Text is generally effective in using and modifying style, and contains some rhetorically appropriate or purposeful stylistic markers in diction, tone, formatting, and presentation.	Text is generally ineffective in using and modifying style, and may contain few rhetorically appropriate or purposeful stylistic markers in diction, tone, formatting, and presentation.	Text is very ineffective in using and modifying style, and contains no rhetorically appropriate or purposeful stylistic markers in diction, tone, formatting, and presentation.	

LO 1.3 - COMPOSE RHETORICALLY EFFECTIVE TEXTS: 1.3 Compose texts that resist overly simplistic binary thinking by engaging various perspectives about topics and/or texts					
	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
LO 1.3 Complexity/Weighing of multiple perspectives *Note, this can incorporate writers' own perspectives, but this would still need to include nuance, evidence, or qualification to claims.	Demonstrates an understanding of the topic's complexity by avoiding a dependency on simplistic binary thinking. Various perspectives are considered thoughtfully and with empathy for other positions, so as to show how the writer has taken a position that is well-supported and has sincerely considered alternative views.	Writing about topics demonstrates engagement with multiple perspectives which bring some nuance, evidence, or qualification to claims. Writer's position has been shaped by consideration of alternative views.	Writing about topics demonstrates inconsistent engagement with multiple perspectives. Although they may include many instances of support for their positions, the claims about perspectives may lack nuance, qualification, or evidence.	Writing about topics includes no complexity or multiplicity in perspectives.	

Note to scorers: If the writer uses many quotes as evidence, be sure that those quotes are analyzed independently and contextually to show the writer is not just marshalling supportive evidence without consideration of nuance, qualification, or quality of evidence.

LO 2.1 - CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND ETHICAL USE OF SOURCES: Locate and select information that genuinely considers multiple, credible perspectives

	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
LO 2.1a Rhetorically appropriate sources	Sources reflect genres appropriate to the rhetorical context.	Sources include genres which are generally appropriate for the rhetorical context.	Selected sources are generally inappropriate for the rhetorical context.	Sources are absent or inappropriate.	
LO 2.1b Source quality	Most, if not all, sources appear reliable, authoritative and of good or high quality	Sources are generally reliable, authoritative, and of good or high quality.	A number of sources lack in reliability, authority, or quality.	Sources are clearly lacking in reliability, authority, or quality.	

LO 2.2 - CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND ETHICAL USE OF SOURCES: Demonstrate an engaged, ethical approach to the use of sources, including source citation

	Highest -4	Middle high-3	Middle low-2	Lowest-1	Score
LO 2.2a Substantiation of ideas	Most, if not all, viewpoints and main ideas are substantiated by credible evidence.	Viewpoints and ideas are generally substantiated by evidence.	A number of viewpoints or main ideas are not substantiated, or the evidence lacks credibility.	Almost no or no viewpoints or main ideas are substantiated by credible evidence.	
LO 2.2b Contextualization of sources	Consistent evidence of appropriate and clear source contextualization (e.g., referring to discipline, author attributes)	Considerable evidence of source contextualization, but this may be done somewhat inconsistently or not completely clearly.	Provides little evidence of source contextualization.	Provides no evidence of source contextualization.	
LO 2.2c Crediting research (textual) sources	Attributes and cites all sources consistent with one style manual, 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	
LO 2.2d Crediting visual sources	Attributes and cites all visual materials (e.g., photos, displays, drawings)	Attributes and cites some materials (e.g., photos, displays, drawings)	Does not attributes and cites any materials (e.g., photos, displays, drawings)	Not applicable	
LO 2.2e Distinguishing own from others' ideas	Distinction between own ideas and those of others is consistently clear	Distinctions between own ideas and others' ideas are generally clear, with a few possible moments that lack distinction.	Distinctions between own ideas and others' are generally unclear	No distinction between own ideas and others' ideas	

LO 2.3 - COMPOSE RHETORICALLY EFFECTIVE TEXTS: Compose texts that effectively integrate sources for a clear purpose, audience, and occasion in different modes of presentation					
	Highest -4	**Middle high-3**	**Middle low-2**	**Lowest-1**	**Score**
LO 2.3a Use of sources aligned with purpose, audience, and occasion	Skillful integration of relevant, credible sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the text's audience, purpose, and occasion.	Somewhat successful in integrating relevant and credible sources that help writer develop ideas appropriate for purpose, audience, and occasion.	Introduces sources that are potentially relevant and credible, but does not adequately contextualize them so the reader can see how these are appropriate for purpose, audience, and occasion.	Fails to include relevant and/or credible sources to develop ideas appropriate for purpose, audience, and occasion.	
LO 2.3b Scholarship as conversation	Effective presentation of sources "in conversation" with each other; the relationship between sources is clear. Use of sources leads to insights as a result of competing perspectives and interpretations	Sometimes presents sources "in conversation" with each other; the relationship between sources is mostly, but not always clear. Some statements or positions are shaped by the competing perspectives or interpretations.	Multiple sources are discussed, but the relationship among sources is generally not made clear. Sources are not in dialogue with each other (although may follow some logic such as chronological presentation).	Considers sources in isolation from each other.	
LO 2.3c Use of data (e.g., student generated data, others' data, or other relevant exhibits (if applicable)	Selects and integrates data or exhibits that clearly support the development ideas appropriate to the purpose/audience/ occasion of the work.	Selection and integration of data or exhibits is mostly effective and appropriate to the purpose/audience/ occasion of the work.	Selection and integration of data or exhibits is generally ineffective and/or inappropriate to the purpose/audience/ occasion of the work.	Writing does not contain data or exhibits.	
LO 2.3d Complexity/Weighing of multiple perspectives *Note, this can incorporate writers' own perspectives, but this would still need to include nuance, evidence, or qualification to claims.	Demonstrates an understanding of the topic's complexity by avoiding a dependency on simplistic binary thinking. Various perspectives are considered thoughtfully and with empathy for other positions, so as to show how the writer has taken a position that is well-supported and has sincerely considered alternative views.	Writing about topics demonstrates engagement with multiple perspectives which bring some nuance, evidence, or qualification to claims. Writer's position has been shaped by consideration of alternative views.	Writing about topics demonstrates inconsistent engagement with multiple perspectives. Although they may include many instances of support for their positions, the claims about perspectives may lack nuance, qualification, or evidence.	Writing about topics includes no complexity or multiplicity in perspectives.	

LO 2.3e & 2.4: MULTIMODALITY & LEARNING AND DISCOVERY No coding necessary. THIS WILL BE DONE BY OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT				
	LO 2.3e Texts produced include multiple modes and/or genres	LO 2.4a Writing process activities guide students through idea generation and refinement.	LO 2.4b Information literacy activities guide students through idea generation and refinement.	Score
Identify if each element is present (0 = no, 1 = yes, 9= not sure from information provided)	(write score here)	(write score here)	(write score here)	

OVERALL					
	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 CTW2?					

Code up to 5 elements that most affect your rating. Use the numbers below to indicate your choices on the scoring sheet in the designated areas
1. Rhetorical analysis
2. Issue exigence
3. Analysis/argument/interpretation
4. Organization
5. Style
6. Complexity
7. Rhetorical use of sources
8. Scholarship as conversation
9. Student-generated data
10. Rhetorically appropriate sources
11. Multiple credible sources
12. Counter evidence
13. Source quality
14. Substantiation of ideas
15. Analysis and contextualization of sources
16. Accuracy
17. Crediting sources
18. Distinguishing own from others' ideas
19. Other (open response)