**Writing Scoring Rubric**

**ED 360, Collaborative Methodology**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CATEGORY | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | RATING |
| Focus, Purpose, Thesis | Engaging and full development of a clear thesis as appropriate to assignment purpose | Competent thesis; thesis represents sound and adequate understanding of the topic or assignment. | Mostly intelligible ideas; thesis or assignment purpose is weak, unclear, or indirectly supported | Simplistic and unfocused ideas, showing signs of confusion or misunderstanding of concept; little or no sense of purpose or thesis |  |
| Content Development and Disciplinary Language | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to develop a coherent response.  Response is written using precise discipline-specific professional language. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop a coherent response.  Response is written using discipline-specific language. Some casual language. | Uses appropriate content to develop a response.  Response is written using few examples of discipline-specific language. Many examples of casual language. | Does not use appropriate content to develop a response.  Response does not include discipline-specific language. Many examples of casual language. |  |
| Sources and Evidence | Response is clearly and compellingly supported through the use of specific references to the words or ideas of key authors, theorists, and/or anchor texts | Response is clearly supported through the use of references to the words or ideas of key authors, theorists, and/or anchor texts | Response is supported in some instances through the use of references to the words or ideas of key authors, theorists, and/or anchor texts | Response is minimally or unsupported through the use of references to the words or ideas of key authors, theorists, and/or anchor texts |  |
| Advocacy | Clearly and convincingly incorporates a dispositional statement regarding advocacy as a guiding thesis and throughout the response. | Incorporates a dispositional statement regarding advocacy as the guiding thesis, but not throughout the entire response | Articulates a dispositional statement regarding advocacy , but does not use it to support the response | Does not articulate or incorporate a dispositional statement regarding advocacy in the response |  |
| Knowledge of Special Education Processes and Laws | Clearly and convincingly incorporates knowledge of both special education processes and laws to guide the response. | Incorporates knowledge of both special education processes and laws but the knowledge does not guide the response | Incorporates limited knowledge of both special education processes and/or laws to guide the response | Does not incorporate knowledge of special education into the response. OR provides inaccurate information regarding special education. |  |
| Language Conventions  (grammar, spelling, introduction/supporting body paragraphs/conclusion) | Contains few, if any errors in the conventions of the English language | Contains some errors in the conventions of the English language | Contains multiple errors in the conventions of the English language | Contains multiple serious errors in the conventions of the English language in that the errors interfere with the reader’s understanding of the response |  |

*Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Question* | *Focus* | *Content Development* | *Sources and Evidence* | *Language* | *Conceptual Framework* |
| *1* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *2* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *3* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *4* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Total Score*