

George Mason University
Karen Gentemann, Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Written Communication Assessment Proposal, 2007-2008
Feb. 28th, 2008

1.0 Definition of Terms:

1.1 Definition of the Competency and Learning Goals (APRT 1.1 and 1.3 combined)

Written communication is one of the foundation requirements of Mason's general education curriculum. Mason's nationally recognized writing program emphasizes writing as a process: it is not simply a way of communicating already formulated thoughts, but a way of discovering, exploring and developing new ideas. On their way to completing a paper, students go through the recursive processes of researching, drafting, and revising; at all stages they engage in critical thinking.

To ensure development of writing competence, Mason has several requirements in place: English 100/101 (first-year composition), English 302 (advanced writing in the disciplines), and a Writing Intensive (WI) course in the major. The English composition requirements support writing in the disciplines and are part of the sequence of courses that make up Mason's Writing Across the Curriculum program. Students who successfully complete one or more writing-intensive courses in their major will be able to:

- analyze and synthesize course content using methods appropriate to the major;
- make reasoned, well-organized arguments with introductions, thesis statements, supporting evidence, and conclusions appropriate to the major;
- use credible evidence, to include, as applicable, data from credible primary and/or secondary sources, integrated and documented accurately according to styles preferred in the major;
- employ rhetorical strategies suited to the purpose(s) and audience(s) for the writing, to include appropriate vocabulary, voice, tone, and level of formality;
- produce writing that employs the organizational techniques, formats, and genres (print and/or digital) typical in the major and/or workplace;
- produce writing that demonstrates proficiency in standard edited American English, including correct grammar/syntax, sentence structure, word choice, and punctuation.

1.2 Criteria

Faculty at Mason recognize that there are general criteria for academic writing and that disciplines have their own distinctive criteria, goals, and priorities for student writing deriving from epistemological and rhetorical differences. For this reason, the university has been conducting discipline-based, course-embedded writing assessment since 2000. Each department identifies a representative who attends a workshop to learn the process for assessing writing holistically and who subsequently leads a team of faculty from his/her department in assessing papers from upper-division WI courses. As part of this process, the departmental faculty develop a scoring rubric that specifies the criteria for writing relevant to their discipline. The assessment process is overseen by the Writing Assessment Group, which was appointed by the Provost in fall 2000 with representation from each college and school.

Attachment One, *Mason Writing Assessment Checklist*, shows the criteria that appear most frequently on discipline-specific rubrics developed between 2001 and 2007. These fall under six broad categories:

- Audience/Purpose/Context
- Content

- Organization/Structure
- Sources/Evidence/Documentation
- Mechanics/Style (Sentence Level)
- Other Discipline-Specific Criteria

While in departmental assessment workshops, faculty may articulate, rank, and categorize criteria differently on their rubrics based on disciplinary conventions, they always specify three levels of competence for each of the criteria: “more than satisfactory,” “satisfactory,” and “less than satisfactory.” Attachments Three and Four show two examples of discipline-specific rubrics, one from the Theater Department and one from the School of Management.

To satisfy the “value-added” requirement, the Writing Assessment Group at Mason will require all rubrics for pre- and post-assessments to include the same four-level scale to rate *overall writing competence* in addition to the criteria identified by departmental faculty. Attachment Two presents detailed *common* standards for four levels of *overall writing competence* across disciplines and across class levels:

- Level One: Not Competent College-Level Writing
- Level Two: Emerging College-Level Writing Competence
- Level Three: Competent College-Level Writing
- Level Four: Highly Competent College-Level Writing

For both pre- and post-assessments, faculty will continue to develop and use their own scoring rubrics, but they will use the same scale and general standards (presented in Attachment Two) for an overall rating.

2.0 Methodology:

2.1 Description of the Value-Added Analytical Approach

Mason uses a course-embedded, cross-sectional approach to assess written communication competence. We will build on Mason's tradition of faculty-led assessment of writing in the discipline and add a new pre-assessment component. Given the structure of our writing program (details in Section 2.2), a pre-assessment will be conducted when students are starting the writing program in a first-year composition course and a post-assessment will be conducted when students are completing their WI course(s) in the major. Instructors teaching the targeted courses give various writing assignments, but at least one major assignment is a research-based paper. Instructors submit copies of these papers to the assessment liaison of the course/department. A team of faculty blind-rates all, or a sample of, the papers using a course-/discipline-specific rubric. Each paper also receives an overall rating. These ratings will be collected and compiled for a value-added analysis.

A pre-assessment will be embedded in English 100 and English 101 (see Section 2.3 for reasons for selecting these courses) in fall 2008 and the results will be reported to SCHEV in spring 2009. However, it is logistically impossible to conduct a post-assessment in all WI courses in a single semester or academic year. More than 100 WI courses are offered each fall or spring semester with more than 4,000 students enrolled. Departmental faculty also need to be trained on how to assess writing holistically. Therefore, the post-assessment will be conducted department by department following a reporting schedule specified by the Writing Assessment Group. Each departmental report presents a snapshot of its students' writing competence at the time of assessment. The post-assessment results reported to SCHEV will be based on all the assessed papers from 2008 to 2012. A comparison of pre- and post-assessment

results will show a difference in levels of competence between students who are about to complete a first-year composition course and students who are about to complete a WI course in the major. The reason for such a difference is not limited to taking a WI course, but a student's entire writing experience at Mason.

2.2 Mason's Writing Program

Mason students develop college writing skills and abilities at the freshman level in English 101 (English 100 for students whose first language is other than English) and build on those skills in English 302 (advanced writing in the disciplines). In addition to English composition, and as part of the university's commitment to competent writing in all programs, at least one course in each major has been designated "writing intensive (WI)." While other courses in the major may require written projects, WI courses (upper-division courses) emphasize the process of drafting and revision with teacher feedback. Faculty in these courses give constructive comments on drafts of at least one course project that the students then revise and resubmit and/or incorporate into subsequent papers. The draft, feedback, and revision process in WI courses helps students improve their writing and increases their understanding of their field of study.

2.3 Pre-Assessment Student Population, Data Collection Technique and Measurement Strategies

All Mason students need to take English 101 or English 100 (equivalent to English 101) unless they have successfully passed an in-house exemption exam, earned a sufficient score on an AP or IB exam, or transferred in credits to fulfill this requirement. English 101 has a large enrollment in fall semesters: it offers 80-100 sections with a total enrollment of 1500-1700 students. In spring semesters, the enrollment drops to about 300 students. For English 100, the enrollment is fewer than 100 students in each semester. On average, 80% of the students who enroll in English 100/101 are freshmen and 10% are sophomores. Most of them started college at Mason and one fourth have not declared a major.

Ideally, in order to compare pre and post writing samples, it is best to have roughly equivalent writing assignments and learning expectations. We have determined that a research-based essay, assigned in most sections of English 100/101, is the assignment most likely to be common across sections and parallel to writing assignments given in WI courses; thus, it is the best pre-assessment for this value-added assessment approach. (As indicated below, the assignments in WI courses vary, but nearly all are research-based writing.) The skills and strategies needed to conduct a research-based assignment are introduced and developed over the semester in English 100/101 and students are required to revise their papers at least once. Thus, the research assignment is not completed until late in the semester, which, for our pre-assessment, means we are actually assessing student work that reflects improvement from initial matriculation into the university. Nonetheless, we feel this is pedagogically the best way to conduct our pre-assessment.

In fall 2008, we will collect a random sample of 10% of these student papers. Faculty who teach the course will participate in a scoring workshop, in which they first develop a scoring rubric, specify standards, and then blind-rate sample papers. Each paper will be rated by two reviewers. If they assign different overall ratings to a paper, a third reader will be used to determine the final rating.

It should be noted that the pre-assessment results will largely represent first-time college students of Mason, not transfers. Faculty at Mason have had an extensive discussion about how to conduct a writing assessment of transfer students when they first transfer into Mason. Such data would be very valuable for course and curricular planning. However, a university-level pre-assessment of transfers is practically

impossible given the limited resources we have. Transfer students are accepted in every semester into every class level. One suggestion was to require all transfers to take a writing test immediately after they transfer into Mason. But such a test will not be equivalent to the research-based assignments given in a composition course. Thus, the test results will not be comparable to those collected from English 100/101. Therefore, we strongly encourage individual faculty members and/or programs to use alternative classroom assessment techniques to evaluate students' preparation for academic writing and address possible differences between first-time students and transfers. No university-level pre-assessment of transfers will be conducted.

2.4 Post-Assessment Student Population, Data Collection Technique and Measurement Strategies

Every undergraduate program designates at least one upper-level WI course for its majors. Some programs, such as government and international politics, public administration, psychology, integrative studies, and art history, have several WI courses. Each semester, more than 4,000 Mason students enroll in at least one WI course. They have declared a major and are most likely in junior or senior classes. Each WI course enrolls students who entered Mason as freshmen and students who transferred, both of whom are representative of the student population in the major.

Mason has been successfully conducting writing assessment in WI courses department by department on a cyclical basis since 2000. The Writing Assessment Group at Mason has a four-part assessment strategy:

1. **Faculty Survey and Student Survey:** A faculty survey was conducted in fall 2000 to identify their perceptions of students' writing abilities. They were asked about the writing preparedness of freshmen and transfers, and their level of satisfaction with the competence of seniors on 17 writing criteria. Faculty also noted the number and kinds of writing assignments they use in their undergraduate classes. As a part of the Graduating Senior Survey, seniors are asked to reflect on their writing experiences at Mason and rate their growth and competence in writing. The survey results are analyzed and shared among the Mason community.
2. **A Holistic Scoring Workshop for Departmental Representatives:** The training workshop is offered periodically to engage faculty representatives from across the disciplines in a validation procedure for measuring writing competence. Besides helping participants hone their own standards of student writing competence, the workshop provides a model that participants may use with their colleagues as they work toward determining departmental standards for student writing.
3. **Scoring in the Departments/Majors:** Faculty who have gone through the Holistic Scoring Workshop lead a team of faculty from their departments in writing assessment. The departmental liaison collects research-based papers from WI courses, which are determined to be typical of writing assigned in the major. Each department then holds a scoring session, in which faculty specify criteria, develop a scoring rubric, and then blind-rate a randomly selected sample of papers. For programs with small enrollments, faculty will rate all collected papers.
4. **Departments Reporting Results:** Following a reporting template developed by the Writing Assessment Group, each department documents its own writing criteria, the assessment process, major findings, and future plans to improve student writing.

The Writing Assessment Group is currently modifying the reporting schedule in order to incorporate writing assessment into the Academic Program Review processes at Mason, which require degree programs to directly assess students' learning outcomes in key areas such as writing, critical thinking, etc.

Nine departments have been targeted for writing assessment for the 2008-09 academic year. We will provide a detailed reporting schedule to SCHEV once it has been finalized.

2.5 Nature of Value-Added

The proposed plan will reveal student growth in writing: at the first-year level, we expect the majority of students to show “emerging college-level writing competence;” and at the end of the WI courses, we expect the majority of students to achieve “competent college-level writing.” In the post-assessment, most students (regardless of their entering status – first-time freshman or transfer) will demonstrate a deep understanding of course content and produce writing that meets disciplinary criteria and standards. This improvement in writing is a result of, but not limited to, students going through the draft, feedback, and revision processes emphasized in composition courses and WI courses. Before enrolling in WI courses, most students have taken other courses at Mason which have writing assignments that contribute to their growth as well.

2.6 Reliability and Validity

The proposed assessment plan builds on the current writing assessment process at Mason and has good reliability and validity. It has the following advantages:

- Using existing assignments from the courses: students do not need to take an extra test or work on an additional assignment just for writing assessment. Thus, the motivation to write a good paper should be present for most students. Further, in most WI courses, the writing is authentic, i.e., it takes into account issues, strategies, and approaches of the discipline.
- Reliability: the writing criteria and standards are defined by faculty, not imposed on them. In the process of developing a scoring rubric, faculty engage in in-depth discussions about writing criteria and standards expected for the discipline, which, consequently, leads to a high level of inter-rater reliability in the scoring process.
- Writing samples are selected randomly both in the pre- and post-assessments. The results are generalizable to the introductory English composition course in the case of the former, and to writing in the discipline, in the case of the post-assessments.

3.0 Process Evaluation:

3.1 Reporting the Results

The pre-assessment will be conducted in fall 2008 and results will be shared with faculty who teach English 100/101, the Writing Assessment Group, and the General Education Committee. All assessment reports to SCHEV will be posted on the website of the Office of Institutional Assessment at Mason and, thus, are accessible to the Mason community. The assessment results will also be used for the SACS accreditation of the university.

In addition, the Office of Institutional Assessment also publishes its own *In Focus* reports on issues such as competency assessment, which provides the most recent information about learning outcomes assessment activities and results to the Mason community. The *In Focus* reports are widely distributed among faculty and administrators at Mason.

3.2 Use of the Results

The on-going writing assessment in the discipline has already brought about changes to teaching and learning. Several changes are relatively common across units. Most units now share the writing rubrics with new faculty and with TA's, and most put their rubrics on their website or on course WebCT sites to ensure that students know the expectations for writing in that discipline. Faculty are encouraged to add criteria to the general rubric to reflect their own assignment and course expectations. Several units have added a special training for TAs who use the rubric to practice scoring papers and articulate and calibrate their evaluative process to achieve greater uniformity in grading standards across sections and courses. Many planned to make greater use of the Writing Center at Mason. Many units have developed workshops or instituted practices that they believe will help students to be better writers. We expect the writing assessment will continue to help improve courses and programs at Mason.

3.3 Estimated Costs

The estimated costs for implementing the pre-and-post assessment are about \$86,098 a year. There are three major sources of the costs:

- Assessment staff salaries and benefits: the assessment of six SCHEV-required competencies accounts for one third of the total workload for the Office of Institutional Assessment at Mason. A part-time specialist has been hired to assist with writing assessment in WI courses. The total personnel cost is about \$55,000 a year.
- Faculty salaries and benefits: it is estimated that Mason faculty spend about 444 hours on writing assessment related activities in a typical year, including the following:
 - Nine faculty members are currently serving on the Writing Assessment Group;
 - One faculty member offers several holistic writing workshops for departmental representatives in an academic year;
 - One faculty member coordinates pre-assessment in English 100/101;
 - Departmental representatives attend training workshops, coordinate departmental assessment, and report results;
 - Faculty raters develop writing rubrics and rate student papers.According to the statistics from the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting at Mason, the average salary for Mason instructional faculty at all ranks is \$67 per hour. The total estimated cost for faculty salaries and benefits for writing assessment is \$29,748 a year.
- Direct expenditures: about \$1,350 a year is spent for photocopies of student papers and faculty workshop materials.

Mason Writing Assessment Checklist

Compiled from Criteria Included on Discipline-Specific Rubrics Developed between 2001 and 2007

Writing Assessment Criteria and Elements	Level of Competence		
Audience/Purpose/Context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of how knowledge is constructed in discipline/context <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate strategies for intended audience/purpose <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates awareness of conventions for context/genre <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate vocabulary/voice/register (level of formality) <input type="checkbox"/> Follows ethical standards <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meets requirements of the assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of the topic/discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Uses correct methods to analyze data/information/arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate examples/evidence/data to support arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Synthesizes information/data from multiple sources <input type="checkbox"/> Includes diverse/global perspectives <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
Organization/Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Includes an introduction and appropriate conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Has a thesis statement and/or clear topic sentences <input type="checkbox"/> Has appropriate transitions between ideas/arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a logical “flow” of ideas/arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate headings and sub-headings <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
Sources/Evidence/Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Uses sufficient amount and quality of source material <input type="checkbox"/> Uses sources appropriate to assignment/discipline (credible, relevant, current, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Accurately cites and documents sources according to discipline-specific standards (e.g., APA style) <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately integrates/quotes/paraphrases/summarizes information from sources <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
Mechanics/Style (Sentence Level) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Uses correct grammar/syntax/punctuation <input type="checkbox"/> Uses correct and appropriate sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate style/tone/word choice <input type="checkbox"/> Shows evidence of proof-reading <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
Other Discipline -Specific Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates strong critical thinking/reasoning abilities <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates engagement in the topic/ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates original thinking/analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates appropriate creativity/personal voice <input type="checkbox"/> Uses appropriate examples/illustrations/charts/hyperlinks to illustrate complex ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ 	More than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory

Attachment Two: A Definition of Overall Competence in Written Communication

Overall Writing Competence (Check One)

- Level One: Not Competent College-Level Writing
- Level Two: Emerging College-Level Writing Competence
- Level Three: Competent College-Level Writing
- Level Four: Highly Competent College-Level Writing

Overall competence in college-level written communication in print and digital environments includes an understanding of audience, purpose, genre, content, and thinking processes appropriate to the level of course, as demonstrated through the appropriate use of rhetorical and (inter)disciplinary/workplace conventions, to include:

- format, tone, and vocabulary;
- organization of argument/information;
- evidence from experience, observation, and/or primary and secondary sources; and
- standard edited American English.

Overall Rating	Definition
Highly Competent	The writer demonstrates a strong and clear understanding of audience, purpose, genre, discipline- or course-content, and the thinking processes appropriate to an intermediate or advanced college course, as evidenced by the use of appropriate format, tone, and vocabulary; clear organization and thorough development of argument/information; credible evidence integrated and documented accurately; and standard edited American English. The writing makes a substantive, original argument or other contribution to the field; it demonstrates strong sentence-level fluency and/or has a clear authorial voice.
Competent	The writer demonstrates a competent understanding of audience, purpose, genre, content, and the thinking processes appropriate to intermediate college-level coursework, as evidenced by the use of appropriate format, tone, and vocabulary; clear organization and development of argument/information; and credible evidence integrated and documented accurately. While all of these rhetorical elements are present, some may be less developed or uneven. Though an argument may be clearly stated, it may lack originality and/or depth. The writing may contain some errors in standard edited American English but readability is not compromised.
Emerging	The writer demonstrates an emerging understanding of audience, purpose, and content, and the thinking processes appropriate for an introductory level of college writing competence, as evidenced by the use of appropriate format, tone, and vocabulary; organization of argument/information; and integration and documentation of supporting evidence. While these rhetorical elements have been attempted, some may be less-than-satisfactorily accomplished. The writing may contain some errors in standard edited American English that do not consistently compromise readability.
Not Competent	The writer demonstrates little understanding of audience, purpose, format, and/or the thinking processes appropriate to college-level writing. A majority of these rhetorical elements are weak or absent, as evidenced by an unclear sense of audience and/or purpose; confusing organization and/or format; weak, inappropriate, and/or undocumented evidence. Writing that displays frequent errors in standard edited American English that consistently compromise readability may be rated at this level particularly if other key rhetorical features are weak or absent.

Attachment Three: Writing Assessment Rubric I
Theatre Department

Writing competency in the Department of Theatre will be met when students:

1. Demonstrate the Ability to Organize Writing as evidenced by:
 - Clear Thesis Statement,
 - Clear Introduction and Conclusion,
 - Clear Connection of Ideas from Sentence to Sentence and Paragraph to Paragraph.

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

2. Demonstrate Convincing and Persuasive Analysis as evidenced by:
 - Strong Support of Claims with Appropriate Examples, Illustrations, and Details,
 - Contextualized Examples as Compelling Evidence, and
 - Confident and Appropriate Voice.

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

3. Demonstrate Critical Thinking Within the Discipline as evidenced by:
 - Interesting and Discrete Ideas,
 - Originality of Ideas,
 - Insightfulness, and
 - Reasoned Articulation of Personal Point of View.

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

4. Use Correct Grammar and Mechanics as evidenced by:
 - Correct and Interesting Syntax,
 - Interesting Diction,
 - Appropriate Citations, and
 - Correct Punctuation and Spelling.

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

5. Fulfill the Goals of the Assignment as evidenced by:
 - Following directions and
 - Completing all tasks.

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

6. Overall, this paper is:

More than Satisfactory _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory _____

Attachment Four: Writing Assessment Rubric II
The School of Management

	Highly Competent	Competent	Not Competent	N/A
Formatting & Sentence Level Concerns: Internally consistent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formatted according to instructions including appropriate use of headings and other required elements. Free of sentence and syntax errors (e.g. fragments, run-ons, comma splices, grammatically unparallel sentence, and incorrect or awkward wording and word choice). Employs correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation (e.g. subjects and verbs agree, tenses are consistent, words are correctly capitalized, homonyms are used correctly, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few errors in spelling or grammar (proof read, not just spell-checked!). Generally follows format as instructed; there are no major errors in formatting. May sometimes use improper parallel structure, inappropriate words, or occasionally miss sentence boundaries. May contain an inappropriate switch in tense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequent problems causing the reader to halt or struggle. Includes sentence run-ons, fragments, comma splices, and non-parallel structures and/or errors in grammar, syntax, word choice, spelling, and punctuation. Errors in the first sentences of the document cause immediate bad impression. Incorrect, little, or no formatting. 	
<i>If the above requirements for competency are not met, the writing can not be considered competent.</i>				
Audience, Tone, and Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted work contains proper techniques and organization to effectively achieve intended purpose. Prose selected is the most appropriate for audience. Uses appropriate quoting with signal phrases. Indicates proper quoting for fact and for opinion/demonstration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted work fulfills most of the assignment. Addresses the audience using an appropriate tone and voice, but the work might not be overly persuasive or convincing based on phrasing. Word choice and/or level of detail should be more effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted work does not follow the assignment. Does not address the audience appropriately. Contains poor word choice. Does not persuade or present position well. 	
Content: Analysis and thought quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is clearly and concisely stated and exhibits mastery of material/topic. The work represents appropriate specificity and analysis, including logical presentation of information, critical thinking, persuasion, and appropriate conclusions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content is stated but may not indicate thorough knowledge of material/topic. The work contains the required elements, but does not show synthesis and/or analysis. May not be persuasive and lacks a strong conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not demonstrate a clear grasp of content and/or content is not relevant. The flow is not consistent or logical. Conclusion may be a repetition of previously stated passages. 	
Organization and Flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear, balanced, well-developed, including a well-stated thesis; related points to support that thesis; and applicable, logically presented, specific evidence with appropriate transitions between sections. Paragraphs are appropriate length. Points are clearly made and are not overly-reliant on quotations from sources. Concluding paragraph developed from the argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes a thesis statement, which may not be the most effective argument. Provides some support for the thesis but may be lacking full support. Writer may rely heavily on quotations from sources, but the intent is clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not include a thesis. Does not provide logical support for thesis and purpose of written work. Relies too heavily on quoted sources, and a summary statement or conclusion may not be presented. 	
Use of Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple, credible sources to support arguments and assertions. Always uses proper citation format. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses sources and proper citation format, but may not select the best sources or provide strong support for the argument presented. May rely heavily on one source throughout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not use appropriate sources or sources are missing entirely. May not use required citation format. 	
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the above criteria are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the above criteria are met or exceeded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance indicates lack of competence. 	