

Scoring Rubric—Graduate Writing Requirement, MA in Communication

Scoring Level	Style and Format	Mechanics	Content and Organization
5= Exemplary	In addition to meeting the requirement for a "4," the paper consistently models the language and conventions used in the scholarly/professional literature appropriate to the student's discipline. The manuscript would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in a peer reviewed communication journal in the student's field of study.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," the paper is essentially error free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," excels in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas, which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.
4=Accomplished	While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. 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. Suitably models the discipline's overall documentation style.	While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures such as subheadings are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.	Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Summarizes relevant literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a creative and innovative manner thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a re-statement of known ideas.
3=Satisfactory	The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). The style may be difficult to follow so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.	Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective vocabulary is used.	Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.
2=Developing	While some of the discipline's conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is some confusion in the proper use of vocabulary and terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point. Appropriate transitions are lacking.	The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.
1=Beginning	The stylistic conventions of the discipline are not followed. Fails to demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation. Inappropriate style and format make reading and comprehensibility problematic.	Paper contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and/or sentence structure, which make following the logic of the paper extremely difficult.	Analysis of existing scholarly / professional literature on the topic is inadequate. Content is poorly focused and lacks organization. The reader is left with little information about or little understanding of the paper's topic.