

## Written Communications & Critical Thinking

- *Students can effectively present their ideas and express themselves in writing for a variety of purposes to both professional and academic audiences. (WC)*
- *Students can read a range of texts in order to extract and construct meaning. (WC)*
- *Students examine issues, ideas, artifacts, and events in order to generate and evaluate assertions and conclusions. (CT)*

Student ID# (required): \_\_\_\_\_

Course: Critical Studies  Visual Studies

Does student appear to have native-level (or roughly equivalent) competency in English: Yes  No

**Directions:** Please circle one box in each row that best describes the written communications/critical thinking skills demonstrated in the project. [FAQ](#)

|  | Introductory<br>1  | Developing<br>2                                  3  |  | Capstone<br>4   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Genre &amp; Disciplinary Conventions (Formal and informal rules inherent in expository writing in the academic field.) (WC)</b> | No evident organizational or presentation system.  | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.  | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.  | Demonstrates <u>consistent use of important conventions</u> particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.                                     |
| <b>Sources &amp; Evidence (Uses support where appropriate) (WC)</b>  | Begins to attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing; sources may be irrelevant and/or inappropriate.  | Inconsistently uses <u>credible and/or relevant</u> sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and assignment.  | <u>Consistently</u> uses credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and assignment.   | Demonstrates <u>skillful</u> use of <u>high-quality, credible, relevant sources</u> to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline assignment.  |
| <b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics (WC)</b>  | Syntax and mechanics sometimes impede meaning because of significant errors in usage. Lacks transitions.   | Syntax/mechanics generally convey meaning clearly, although writing may include some significant usage errors. Some transitions aid understanding.  | Syntax and mechanics have few usage errors and convey meaning clearly. Little variety in rhetorical structures. Transitions generally aid understanding.   | Uses syntax/mechanics gracefully, communicating meaning to readers with clarity and fluency; virtually error-free. Transitions varied and effective.  |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) (CT)</b>  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.   | Specific position clearly stated; acknowledges/notes different facets of an issue but does not utilize them in constructing own position.   | Specific position clearly stated; takes into account some complexities of the issue(s). Others' points of view are acknowledged within position.   | Specific position is imaginative, taking into account complexities of an issue. Limits of position are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position.  |
| <b>Source Analysis (Analysis and evaluation to investigate a point of view or conclusion) (CT)</b>                                 | Information from source(s) engaged without interpretation or evaluation. Viewpoints of others/experts accepted as fact, without question, or rejected a priori, without exploration of their validity. | Information from source(s) engaged with <u>some</u> interpretation or evaluation, but <u>not</u> enough to develop convincing analysis. Viewpoints of others/experts are accepted/rejected with little questioning. | Information from source(s) engaged with <u>enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a convincing analysis.</u> Viewpoints of others/experts are subject to questioning on reasonable grounds, but grounds may not be fully articulated. | Information from source(s) engaged with enough interpretation/evaluation/relevance to develop a comprehensive analysis. Viewpoints of others/experts questioned thoroughly and accepted/rejected for clearly articulated reasons. |

**Note:** Completed rubrics will not be identified with any particular course/instructor.