SOM GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

Faculty Assessment of Learning Goal 2:

Students are able to clearly and effectively communicate their discipline to members of the academic community through writing.

Student’s Name: ___________________________ Date of Examination: ____________________________________

Rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations 4</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 3</th>
<th>Meets Some Expectations 2</th>
<th>Does not Meet Expectations 1</th>
<th>Student’s Score (indicate 1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student’s writing adheres to style and format commonly found within the discipline.</td>
<td>The paper goes beyond the criteria for a “3,” to consistently model the language and conventions used in the scholarly/professional literature appropriate to the student’s discipline. The manuscript would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in the student’s field of study.</td>
<td>While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are consistently observed throughout the paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. Suitably models the discipline’s overall scholarly style.</td>
<td>Appropriate style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. Some less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information) are used. Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. Style difficulties detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.</td>
<td>While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student’s writing is sound in terms of mechanics</td>
<td>The paper goes beyond the criteria for a “3,” to being essentially error-free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and help the reader follow the writer’s logic.</td>
<td>While there may be minor errors, the paper follows conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.</td>
<td>Grammatical conventions are generally followed, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in some weak connections between topics within the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features, making it somewhat difficult for the reader to stay on track in the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.</td>
<td>Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or difficulties with other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
The student’s writing is sound in content and organization.

The paper goes beyond the criteria for a “3,” to excelling in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.

Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Does a credible job summarizing related literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner thereby making the paper more than a re-statement of known ideas.

Conventional ideas are presented with little expansion and development. Certain logical connections or specific topics related to the student's area of study are lacking. Pertinent ideas and concepts are generally accounted for, although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic, such that its importance within the student's area of study becomes clear.

The student’s writing is weak in content and organization.

The paper generally fails to synthesize ideas as a way of arriving at new concepts. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and topics may seem disconnected.

Weakness is evident in the coverage of the field and in the analysis, resulting in an incorrect or poorly developed synthesis. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting document is difficult to follow, to the point where the reader is not sure how far the writer's knowledge extends.

---

Evaluator’s Name (please print):

Evaluator’s Signature:

Role on Committee (please circle one): ADVISOR COMMITTEE MEMBER

Instructions

Direct assessment of written communication skills will take place for masters students at the final written examination and for doctoral students at the written portion of the candidacy examination and the written portion of the dissertation/document defense. The advisor will distribute a rubric to each committee member at the examination, and then collect and return the completed rubrics to the Chair of Graduate Studies immediately following the examination for entry into TracDat.
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