

Scoring Rubric for EDMA 696 Comprehensive Exam

	Performance Standards: The levels at which students perform the task		
	Not Acceptable (1)	Acceptable (2)	Well-Done (3)
Content & Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are disjointed and do not respond to the questions/prompt. Information is very limited or unclear. Citations are either not provided, are inappropriate to the prompt/questions, or are a questionable interpretation of the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are clear; appropriate details contribute to the understanding of the reader. There response is comprehensive and logical. Though there may be some small gaps in the logic and some of the writing may be unclear, it is easy to follow the thinking of the writer. Where needed, responses are supported with appropriate citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are crystal clear; specific and important details help the reader understand the response. The response is comprehensive, coherent, and logical; the writer is able to thoughtfully integrate appropriate research and theory with effective practice. Appropriate citations are provided to substantiate recommendations/ responses.
Organization & Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear introduction, focus, or conclusion; transitions are weak; noticeable gaps in information confuse and confound the reader; pacing is awkward; the lack of organization ultimately obscures or distorts the main points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reader can easily follow what’s being said, but the overall organization may sometimes be ineffective or too obvious. Over all, transitions are smooth and the pace seems appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization enhances and showcases the central ideas and theme. The order, structure and response is compelling and moves the reader through the text. Details fit where they are placed; sequencing is logical and effective; transitions are smooth.
Written Expression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writer seems indifferent and uninvolved; the writing is flat, stiff, or mechanical; the writer appears to be struggling for the right words to convey meaning; responses are difficult to follow. Convention errors (grammar, mechanics, spelling) impede or block meaning. Response does not conform to writing convention as outlined in the <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language is ordinary but conveys the message; sentences tend to be mechanical rather than fluid, although, for the most part, the text appears efficient and pleasant. There are few errors in conventions and they do not interfere with meaning. Adherence to writing convention as outlined in the <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writer speaks directly to the reader; words convey the intended message in an interesting, precise and natural way; the writing is consistently strong and makes the reading easy and enjoyable. There are few, if any, errors in conventions; instead, grammar, mechanics and spelling facilitate the reader in understanding the text. Adherence to writing convention as outlined in the <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition</i>.

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MASTERS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM**

Rubric for Initial Writing Assessment and Advancement to Candidacy

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR
4 EXCEPTIONAL	Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Accurately interprets evidence statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. Draws warranted judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies key results and procedures, explain assumptions and reason. Fair mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. Appropriate use of mechanics and sentence structure. Citations and references meet APA style.
3 ACCEPTABLE	Does most or many of the following: Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view. Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. Minor mechanical errors. Citations and references meet APA style.
2 PARTIAL	Does most or many of the following: Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative point of view. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons, Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on elf-interest or preconceptions. Some serious mechanical errors. Citations and references attempt to meet APA style.
1 NOT ACCEPTABLE	Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends view based on self-interest or preconceptions. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason. Many mechanical errors and weak sentence structure. Citations and references do not meet APA style or are not included.