

## **ESAC Integrated Writing Assessment (IWA)**

### **Rubric: Generative AI in Higher Education**

#### **Essay Topic**

***The integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in higher education: challenges to academic integrity, benefits for learning, and the extent of institutional adoption.***

---

#### **Assessment Criteria Overview**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<b>1. Task Response &amp; Argument</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>2. Critical Thinking &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>3. Use of Sources &amp; Referencing</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>4. Academic Writing Style &amp; Register</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>5. Organisation &amp; Cohesion</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>6. Language Accuracy &amp; Control</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

---

#### **1. Task Response & Argument (20%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Band 9 (Excellent)</b>	<b>Fully addresses all parts of the task with a clear, insightful, and original argument. Demonstrates a nuanced understanding of GenAI's challenges and benefits. Position on university adoption is sophisticated and consistently sustained.</b>
<b>Band 8 (Strong)</b>	<b>Addresses all aspects of the task effectively with a clear and well-developed argument. Demonstrates strong understanding of the topic with minor lapses in depth or nuance. Position is clear and well supported.</b>
<b>Band 7 (Good)</b>	<b>Addresses the task competently but may place uneven emphasis on certain aspects (e.g., more challenges than</b>

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
	<b>benefits). Argument is clear but may lack refinement or full balance.</b>
<b>Band 6 (Satisfactory)</b>	<b>Responds to the task but may partially address key elements or present a simplistic position. Argument may be descriptive rather than analytical.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below (Limited–Poor)</b>	<b>Does not adequately address the task. Argument may be unclear, underdeveloped, or largely descriptive with significant omissions.</b>

---

## **2. Critical Thinking & Evaluation (20%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
	<b>Demonstrates excellent critical engagement with sources and ideas.</b>
<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Evaluates implications, limitations, and counterarguments insightfully. Shows independent thinking and synthesis.</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>Demonstrates strong critical evaluation of issues and sources. Ideas are analysed rather than merely described, with some acknowledgement of complexity.</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Shows reasonable critical thinking but analysis may be uneven or rely too heavily on source perspectives. Limited exploration of counterarguments.</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>Limited critical evaluation; tends to summarise sources rather than analyse them. Few links between evidence and argument.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below</b>	<b>Minimal or no critical engagement. Largely descriptive or opinion-based with weak support.</b>

---

## **3. Use of Sources & Referencing (20%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Integrates a wide range of high-quality academic sources seamlessly. Paraphrasing is sophisticated and accurate. Referencing is fully consistent with ESAC conventions.</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>Uses an appropriate range of sources effectively. Paraphrasing is accurate with only very minor lapses. Referencing is largely correct with occasional minor errors.</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Uses relevant sources but integration may be mechanical. Some paraphrasing issues or minor referencing inconsistencies.</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>Limited range of sources or over-reliance on a few. Paraphrasing may be weak or too close to original wording. Referencing errors are noticeable.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below</b>	<b>Inadequate sourcing, poor paraphrasing, or frequent referencing errors. Possible risk of plagiarism.</b>

---

#### **4. Academic Writing Style & Register (15%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Consistently formal, precise, and sophisticated academic tone. Excellent control of discipline-appropriate vocabulary.</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>Appropriate academic register throughout with strong lexical choice. Minor occasional slips do not affect clarity.</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Generally academic but may include some informal phrasing or repetitive vocabulary.</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>Inconsistent academic tone. Overly simple or conversational language appears.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below</b>	<b>Inappropriate register with frequent informal or unclear language.</b>

---

#### **5. Organisation & Cohesion (15%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Exceptionally well-structured with clear progression of ideas. Paragraphing is logical and cohesive, with excellent use of linking devices.</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>Clear and logical structure. Paragraphs are well-developed with effective cohesion. Minor organisational lapses may occur.</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Overall structure is clear, but paragraph development or transitions may be uneven.</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>Organisation is weak or repetitive. Ideas may be loosely connected.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below</b>	<b>Poor organisation. Lack of coherence and clear paragraph structure.</b>

---

## **6. Language Accuracy & Control (10%)**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Near-native accuracy. Errors are extremely rare and insignificant.</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>High level of grammatical accuracy with only occasional minor errors that do not impede meaning.</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Some grammatical or lexical errors, but meaning remains generally clear.</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>Frequent errors that occasionally interfere with clarity.</b>
<b>Band 5 and below</b>	<b>Persistent errors that significantly impede understanding.</b>

---

## **Overall Band Guide**

### **Final Band Performance Summary**

<b>Band 9</b>	<b>Outstanding, publication-level academic writing</b>
<b>Band 8</b>	<b>Strong, effective university-level academic writing</b>
<b>Band 7</b>	<b>Competent and clear, but lacks depth or polish</b>

## **Final Band Performance Summary**

**Band 6      Adequate but limited academic performance**

**Band ≤5    Insufficient for ESAC IWA standards**

---