# Informational Report for Non-Expert Readers – Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Almost Meets Expectations | Needs Work to Meet Expectations | Missing or Incomplete |
| Title Page & Executive Summary | Includes a complete title page and concise executive summary that previews purpose, scope, and findings. | Includes all elements; summary is clear, well-structured, and reader-focused. | Includes required elements with clear purpose and summary; no errors. | Includes most elements; summary may lack clarity or concision. | Missing some required elements or poorly organized. | Lacks title page or executive summary. |
| Introduction | Defines topic, purpose, audience, and scope; provides clear background for non-experts. | Fully addresses all elements with clarity and precision; excellent audience framing. | Clearly defines topic, purpose, audience, and scope; no errors. | Covers topic but may miss one element or use vague language. | Weak or unclear introduction; lacks focus or reader orientation. | Missing or incomplete introduction. |
| Discussion: Organization | Uses a clear, logical structure (topical, chronological, cause–effect, comparative, or problem–background). | Structure enhances comprehension; sections and headings are cohesive. | Logical and consistent structure supports understanding; no errors. | Organization uneven or transitions weak; structure mostly clear. | Lacks coherence or clear organization; hard to follow. | Discussion missing or largely incomplete. |
| Discussion: Content Development | Explains topic thoroughly with definitions, background, examples, and expert perspectives. | Comprehensive, detailed, and accurate information throughout. | Includes sufficient factual detail and clear explanations; accurate and objective. | Adequate coverage but lacks depth, balance, or clarity in some areas. | Limited content or overreliance on generalizations; objectivity unclear. | Missing most required content or evidence. |
| Visual Aids | Includes 4+ relevant visuals (2+ data visualizations) with captions and textual integration. | Highly relevant, well-designed, clearly labeled, effectively integrated. | Includes 4+ appropriate visuals, correctly captioned and cited; no errors. | Visuals present but some lack clarity, labeling, or integration. | Few visuals or unclear purpose; captions or references missing. | No visuals or unrelated visuals included. |
| Objectivity & Tone | Maintains neutral, third-person tone; presents multiple expert perspectives without bias. | Entirely objective, professional, consistent tone. | Maintains neutral tone; balanced expert perspectives; no errors. | Mostly objective; occasional biased wording or uneven balance. | Frequent subjectivity or unsupported claims; tone inappropriate. | Lacks objectivity or fails to address required perspectives. |
| Conclusion | Summarizes main findings and emphasizes significance; offers closure without argument or persuasion. | Clear, well-structured summary that reinforces purpose and key insights. | Accurately summarizes and provides closure; no errors. | Basic summary provided but may lack cohesion or significance. | Weak or abrupt conclusion; missing key points. | No conclusion or summary. |
| Visual & Document Design | Demonstrates visual appeal, readability, and professional formatting (headings, spacing, alignment, fonts). | Visually engaging and professional throughout; enhances readability. | Follows all formatting requirements; clear and consistent. | Minor spacing, font, or alignment issues. | Formatting inconsistent or unprofessional. | Not formatted as a report. |
| Source Use & Documentation | Uses 6–10 credible sources; integrates and cites accurately in discipline style. | All sources credible and smoothly integrated; citations perfect. | Uses required number of credible sources with correct citation format; no errors. | Uses credible sources but minor citation or integration errors. | Inconsistent or incorrect citation; weak source integration. | Missing or unreliable sources; documentation incomplete. |
| Audience Awareness & Accessibility | Uses plain language, clear explanations, and definitions for non-experts. | Highly accessible; expertly simplifies complex ideas for readers. | Consistently clear and accessible; defines all necessary terms. | Mostly clear; may include occasional jargon or assumptions. | Overly technical or difficult for non-experts. | No evidence of audience awareness. |