APPENDIX C

Critical Thinking/Writing Assessment Rubric

PURPOSE:
This rubric evaluates critical thinking/writing skills of the students taking the URP 3000 Planning and Growth Management course, which is the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) course, in the BURP program. The rubric integrates the 4-Point Primary Traits Writing Assessment Rubric developed by the FAU WAC committee for argument-driven essays with additional criteria and emphasis on critical thinking developed by the BURP assessment team. In the URP 3000 class argument-driven, out-of-class papers are assigned to students. In both of these assignments critical thinking and professional writing is the most important assessment criteria.

OPENING:
   1)   **title:** *reflects the essence of the essay (in memos-subject heading)*
   2) **thesis/purpose/argument**: *primary argument (in memos-background and specific task, brief summary of the message)*
   2) **organizational statement**: *description of how the argument will proceed (not relevant in memo style)*

	Extremely Effective*	**Effective***	**Adequate***	**Inadequate***	**Not Acceptable***
1)title	**Clearly** reflects the essence of the essay with concise wording.	**Generally** reflects the essence of the essay.	**Vaguely or partially** reflects the essence of the essay, needs focus on the main argument.	**Does not provide context** for the essay.	Not an argument driven paper.
2) thesis/ purpose/ argument	**Fully and completely** articulates primary argument **in its context** at the **beginning** of the paper.	**Generally** articulates primary argument **in its context** at the **beginning** of the paper.	**Vaguely or partially** articulates primary argument with **minimal context** in the paper.	**May not** articulate primary argument **or** provide context anywhere in the paper.	Not an argument driven paper.
3) organizational statement	Presents a **clear and direct** statement located in the **beginning** of paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/issues. Readers **should be able to anticipate** how the paper will proceed.	Presents a **general** statement located in the **beginning** of the paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/ issues. Readers **should be able to anticipate** how the argument will proceed.	Presents a **vague or partial** statement located **somewhere** in the paper that demonstrates how the argument will track the fundamental, secondary, and implied problems/questions/issues. Readers **may have to infer** how the paper will proceed.	Presents **no** organizational statement. Readers are **not able to infer** how the paper will proceed.	Not an argument driven paper.

ARGUMENT:
    4) developing arguments: *providing insight and originality*
    5) reasoning*: depth and complexity of thought*
    6) support*: data/evidence/visuals*
    7) own perspective: *developing and presenting own perspective, critique of the existing debates.*

	Extremely Effective	Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Acceptable
4) developing arguments	Offers **highly insightful and original arguments** that go far beyond class discussions and readings.	Offers **insightful and original arguments** that are based on class discussions and readings.	Offers **moderately insightful arguments**, there is definitely room for improvement in terms of originality.	Offers **little insight and originality**. The argument remains as an informative summary of existing view points.	Not an argument driven paper.
4) reasoning	Exhibits **substantial depth, fullness**, and **complexity of thought** supported by **sophisticated ideas/analysis** that support the paper's thesis.	Exhibits **some depth, fullness**, and **complexity of thought** though reasoning and evidence may not be uniformly conclusive and convincing.	Exhibits **very little depth, fullness**, and **complexity of thought**; a reasoned response, but the reasoning and presentation of evidence may be somewhat simplistic and/or repetitive.	Exhibits **no depth, fullness**, and **complexity of thought**; lacks clear reasoning, and supporting ideas or evidence may be contradictory, repetitive, or inadequately linked to the thesis.	Not an argument driven paper.
5) Evidence	**Seamlessly** incorporates and explains the accuracy and relevance of data/evidence/visuals; offers evidence from a **variety of** sources, **including** counterarguments/contrary evidence.	Incorporates and examines data/ evidence/ visuals; offers evidence from **some** sources, **including some** counterarguments/ contrary evidence.	Incorporates data/ evidence/ visuals **without** much explanation, and offers **limited** evidence or counterarguments/ contrary evidence.	Incorporates **little or no** data/evidence/visuals **nor corresponding** explanation, and **fails** to address counterarguments/ contrary evidence.	Not an argument driven paper.
6) own perspective	The **perspective of the author is integrated** in a logical manner and sequence. The author makes it evident that he/she understands the other viewpoints and then offers his/her critique.	The perspective of the author is integrated in a logical manner, but there is **room for improvement in terms of critique of the** existing **debates**.	The author offers **little perspective**; the argumentation is mainly a compilation of other perspectives and examples without much critique.	The perspective or the critique of the author **is not provided.**	Not an argument driven paper.

CONCLUSION:

7) implications and consequences: *importance of claims and future possibilities in conclusion (in memos, telling the reader which future actions you want him/her to take).*

	Extremely Effective	Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Acceptable
6) Implications and consequences	Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, consequences, and/or future research possibilities. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence.	Identifies some implications, some consequences, and/or some future research possibilities.	Simply restates argument with little or no reflection on implications or consequences.	Fails to identify conclusions, implications or consequences.	Not an argument driven paper.

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE:

8) rhetorical structure: *transitions, headers, bullets, and other structural indicators appropriate to the discipline*
9) use of quotes: *balancing between quotes and the voice of the author*

	Extremely Effective	Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Acceptable
8) rhetorical structure	The argument's focus is abundantly clear to the reader and paragraphs logically and coherently build upon each other through the complete and fluent use of transitions and/or headings.	The argument's focus is generally clear to the reader and the use of transitions lends a sense of progression and coherence.	The argument's focus is unclear to the reader. Some, mostly formulaic transitions are used, providing little or no sense of direction.	Transitions and sense of progression are absent.	Not an argument driven paper.
9) use of quotes	The amount and use of quotes are well balanced and integrated in the argumentation; author's voice is clearly visible.	The amount and use of quotes are moderately well balanced and integrated in the argumentation; author's voice is somewhat visible.	The author uses too many quotes; his/her voice is kept to minimum.	The whole paper is written as a list of quotes. The voice of the author is not there.	Not an argument driven paper.

DISCIPLINARY CONCERNS:

10) academic tone: specialized terms and concepts

11) disciplinary conventions: document format (not including citations) (in memos-proper memo heading, paragraph and document length)

12) presentation and citation format: in-text citations, works cited, bibliography, references, proper presentation of attachments

	Extremely Effective	Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Acceptable
10) academic tone	Tone is **mature**, **consistent**, and **suitable** for topic and audience. **Uses** specialized terms **accurately** and **consistently**.	Tone is **usually** appropriate. Specialized terms **usually used**, **often consistently**.	Tone **may** have **inconsistencies** in tense and person and **may lapse** at times to colloquial discourse. Specialized terms, if present, are **used superficially**.	Tone is **superficial** and **stereotypical**; **oral** rather than written **language patterns** predominate.	Not an argument driven paper.
11) disciplinary conventions	**Fully adheres** to disciplinary conventions genre, format, document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, images, and footnote/ endnotes.	**Generally adheres** to disciplinary conventions appropriate genre, format, document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, images, and footnote/ endnotes.	**Attempted, but awkward** and inappropriate **adherence** to disciplinary genre, format, document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, images, and footnote/ endnotes.	**Fails to adhere** to disciplinary genre, format, document design, and presentation of graphs, tables, images, and footnote/ endnotes.	Not an argument driven paper.
12) presentation and citation format	Cites and formats sources **accurately and consistently** and provides **appropriate and complete** works cited/ bibliography/ references.	Cites and formats sources **consistently** and provides **appropriate** works cited/ bibliography/ references. **Some errors or flaws** are present.	Cites **some** sources but often **inaccurately**. May **neglect** to include works cited page or to cite some sources altogether. References typically present, but **inaccurate**.	**Little or no** use of presentation and citation formats.	Not an argument driven paper.

GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX:
13) mechanics: *sentence-level patterns of error (e.g. comma splices, run-on sentences, subject/verb agreement, spelling)*
14) clarity *in sentence structure*
15) style: *sentence variety*

	Extremely Effective	Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Acceptable
13) mechanics	Contains virtually **no** sentence level errors.	Contains **infrequent** sentence level errors; one or two patterns of error may be present.	Contains **multiple** errors that **do not impede** comprehension.	Contains **consistent error patterns** that **impede** comprehension.	Not an argument driven paper.
14) clarity	Sentences **consistently communicate** thoughts **clearly**.	Sentences **usually** communicate thoughts clearly.	Sentences may be **wordy** and contain **unclear phrasing and vocabulary**.	Sentences are **frequently wordy** and contain **unclear phrasing and vocabulary**.	Not an argument driven paper.
15) style	Sentences **are** varied, convincing, nuanced, and eloquent.	Sentences **are generally** varied and convincing. **May, at times, be** nuanced and eloquent.	Sentences **may not be** varied or convincing. Language **is not** nuanced or eloquent, but it **does not generally interfere** with communication.	Sentences **are not** varied, convincing, nuanced or eloquent. Sentences are **frequently confusing**.	Not an argument driven paper.

*Extremely effective: 90-100, Effective: 80-90, Adequate: 70-80, Inadequate: 60-70, Not acceptable: Below 60