

# INTD 105 Assessment Rubric

	Coherence and Form	Critical Reading	Critical Writing	Revision
<b>Exceed</b>	Clear, focused, and original thesis or controlling purpose; logical, coherent, and creative development; pertinent and concrete examples used to support ideas; excellent paragraphing; variety and sophistication in sentence structure; tone/diction superbly adapted to audience/subject; nearly flawless mechanics.	Target argument clearly articulated and isolated from extraneous elements (e.g., opinion); parts of argument clearly distinguished; credibility and reasonableness of evidence thoroughly and shrewdly assessed; logic of argument thoroughly and shrewdly assessed; hidden assumptions thoroughly examined.	Student's argument clearly articulated and well supported by means of credible, well-organized evidence and systematic logical reasoning; pertinent qualifications, objections, and alternative viewpoints identified; argument opens out to embrace its context, general significance, or applicability to new problems.	Revision alters substance and approach, re-organizes material, and clarifies/strengthens coherence. Where appropriate, new material added, unhelpful material deleted, more relevant material substituted for less, transitions strengthened, sentences rewritten. Mechanics of finished product nearly flawless.
<b>Meet</b>	Identifiable and focused thesis or controlling idea; logical, coherent, and satisfying development; examples used to support ideas; good paragraphing; well-constructed sentences with only occasional awkwardness; tone/diction show evidence of adaptation to audience/subject; sound mechanics.	Target argument identified and mainly isolated from extraneous elements; parts of argument distinguished; credibility and reasonableness of evidence adequately assessed; logic of argument adequately assessed; hidden assumptions adequately examined.	Student's argument presented and supported by means of evidence and logical reasoning; some qualifications, objections, or alternative viewpoints identified; argument opens out to embrace its context, general significance, or applicability to new problems.	Revision sharpens focus and improves structure/clarity/coherence without altering substance or approach. Where appropriate, existing material re-worked to improve emphasis, relevance, and focus. Mechanics of finished product sound and not an obstacle to understanding.
<b>Approach</b>	Wandering, vague, or unfocused thesis or controlling idea; weak development; inadequate examples used to support ideas; very basic paragraphing; sentences/transitions often unclear, awkward, indirect, or illogical; tone/diction often inappropriate to audience/subject; poor mechanics, sometimes at expense of meaning.	Target argument identified but not adequately isolated from extraneous elements; parts of argument not clearly distinguished; credibility and reasonableness of evidence assessed, but not adequately; logic of argument assessed, but not adequately; hidden assumptions examined, but not adequately.	Student's argument is an assertion not effectively supported by means of evidence and logical reasoning; no qualifications, objections, or alternative viewpoints clearly identified; argument does not open out adequately to embrace its context, general significance, or applicability to new problems.	Revision does not significantly improve original. Problems of structure/clarity/coherence/emphasis/focus remain unaddressed. Changes generally limited to small segments of original, showing little awareness of what "revision" means. Mechanics of finished product remain problematic or are the only focus of revision.
<b>Not Meet</b>	No thesis or controlling idea; very weak or nonexistent development; poor paragraphing; sentences/transitions generally ineffectual; tone/diction generally inappropriate to audience/subject; mechanics so poor that reading disrupted and meaning obscured.	Target argument not identified or not at all isolated from extraneous elements; parts of argument not distinguished; credibility and reasonableness of evidence not assessed; logic of argument not assessed; hidden assumptions not examined.	Student makes neither argument nor clear assertion, or provides little to no support for assertion using evidence and logic; no qualifications, objections, or alternative viewpoints identified at all; argument does not open out at all to embrace its context, general significance, or applicability to new problems.	Revision has not really been attempted, or is completely ineffectual, or is focused almost entirely on mechanics.