|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Significant Evidence** | **Satisfactory Evidence** | **Partial Evidence** | **Negligible Evidence** |
| **Writerly Self-Awareness, Confidence & Voice** | The **writer** takes some risks in and responsibility for their topic and thesis; incorporates a voice that is clearly developing; there is a sense of the writer’s identity in the ***text***; exhibits both self-direction and the ability to integrate feedback. |  |  |  |  |
| **The Writing Process** | The writer offers evidence of their engagement in the **writing process**; has **revised**, **proofread** and **edited** the text before submitting it in final form. |  |  |  |  |
| **Critical Thinking[[1]](#footnote-1), Metacognition and Reflection** | The writer has made up their mind about an issue and articulated how they got there; demonstrates adequacy and accuracy appropriate to the task and their ideas, argument and purpose; avoids jumping to conclusions, suspends judgment until warranted, avoids clichés, and interrogates unquestioned ideological or negligent perspectives; moves from **descriptive reflection** to **dialogic reflection** and finally **critical reflection**. |  |  |  |  |
| **Developing Ideas & Synthesizing Those Ideas with New/Others’ Ideas** | The writer has comprehended, analyzed, synthesized, and appropriately represented (i.e. cited) varying perspectives; attempts to offer original perspectives in light of others’ ideas; includes clear claims/points with related reasons supported by reliable, credible evidence and well-chosen examples and details from their own experience and/or from classroom, public, and/or scholarly discussions. |  |  |  |  |
| **Awareness of Genre & Language Conventions** | The writer exhibits an understanding of and an attempt to work with/in the unique **constraints** and **affordances** of the **genre**; makes intentional and appropriate **multilinguistic** choices that are appropriate to the genre, audience and purpose; meets appropriate expectations for page, word or time count and/or grammar, spelling, mechanics, and punctuation. |  |  |  |  |
| **Awareness of Audience, Sense of Purpose for Texts** (Even Beyond the Classroom) | The writer seeks to have an intended effect on a specific, well-chosen audience; demonstrates what is at stake and why readers should care by effectively employing the rhetorical appeals of *ethos* (credibility/character), *pathos* (emotion) and *logos* (logic) as appropriate to the **rhetorical situation** and assigned task. |  |  |  |  |
| **Connecting With & Getting to Know Students** | The writer has met with the professor to discuss their ideas and to expand or improve their writing and thinking; the professor has likewise been moved, touched or otherwise informed about some aspect of the writer’s life, beliefs and/or culture. |  |  |  |  |
| **Wild Card** | [*Open rubric category for a faculty choice of criteria, dependent on the goals of assignment and course outcomes OR for a student choice of reasonable criteria upon which they wish to be assessed, graded or given feedback.*] |  |  |  |  |

**Teacher Comments**

[*Use this space to extend upon your scores or marks in the above rubric and offer* ***summative*** *assessment (on writing-to-demonstrate-learning activities) and/or* ***formative*** *feedback (for writing-to-learn activities). We recommend focusing on clear examples of one or two strengths in the writer’s attempts at this particular writing task and on about one to three areas to improve upon in order to strengthen, revise and re-envision their writing. Seek to focus students proactively on subsequent drafts and future writing assignments and tasks—in your course and beyond! Students are always learning to write and to “be” writers - rhetorical actors - across our curriculum and out in the world; you may see this as an opportunity to guide them to see that.*]

**Suggestions for Using This Rubric**

1. Review it with your students before an assignment is due. Talk about difficult terminology. Have them revise it using their own words [Group GoogleDoc].
2. Ask students to create their own Wild Card categories based on what they value in their writing. Compare those to your own Wild Card categories.
3. Offer students formative feedback on one or two categories after they’ve submitted a writing-to-learn draft to you. Offer them suggestions on how to build capacity in a particular category and ask them to revise.
4. Use it for talking points or for guiding peer reviews (when students swap assignments and offer feedback to each other).
5. Ask students to use it to write a [Reviewer Memo](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mPPPYxxNnDAPF5nRQdPs9cNH5_ySFIwCjub8ZpaaEug/edit?usp=sharing) to you in which they engage in a critical reflection of their writing process – either at the middle or end of an assignment sequence.
6. Collaborate with your PWSAs on how to use the categories as talking points when they conference with your students about their writing outside of your class. Ask your PWSAs to lead in-class or out-of-class (in ARC) supplemental support workshops on one of the topics above, perhaps one every few weeks, for your students.
7. Look for chapters in the *Norton Field Guide to Writing* that offer students support in these areas and direct them to review those chapters.
8. Host a Rubric Paper Party to which we all bring samples of student writing and assess or offer feedback to students based on the rubric - and drink coffee (or wine)!
9. Start an FYS Writing Values Learning Community to meet and discuss how these values are playing out in your classrooms - what’s working, what’s not.
10. Use the rubric as a guide for talking through the rhetorical strategies and moves made by Dolores Huerta in the Common Read, [*Dolores*](https://www.filmplatform.net/product/dolores/). Or ask students to write a response to the Common Read that requires them to develop or focus on one category from the rubric.
11. Revamp, re-envision, or offer feedback (to Bridget or anyone in [Writing@Bates](https://www.bates.edu/writing/professional-staff/)) on this working, living, breathing, malleable tool, one of many tools you can use to make your writing values apparent to students. Here’s a Values Statement handout that might help.
12. For more ideas, set up a writing consultation meeting with a [Writing@Bates](https://www.bates.edu/writing/professional-staff/) professional staff member.

**Glossary of Terms**

**Writer**: the one/ones who compose the text; writer, rhetor, composer can also be substituted with the word performer, presenter, speaker, or group.

**Text**: refers to any type of composition, written, spoken or performed, that a student, or students, compose. Texts are commonly composed using the mode of alphabetic text, but they can also exist in other modalities (i.e. audio- or video-recordings, graphical or photographic representations, stage presentations, etc.)

**Writing Process**: suggests that writing is an iterative, recursive, nonlinear process; includes brainstorming, generating ideas and topics, refining ideas and topics, researching, writing drafts, revising drafts and sections of drafts, and/or requesting and implementing feedback from peers, ARC staff, the instructor and other readers. [See more on pp 281-327 of the *Norton Field Guide*.]

**Revision vs. Editing vs. Proofreading**: **revisions** are deep and substantive changes to a text, usually shown throughout multiple drafts (can be global and/or particular); [vs.] **editing** is working on the details of paragraphs, sentences, words and punctuation to make your writing appropriately clear for the particular audience, purpose and genre for/in which a student is writing; [vs.] **proofreading** is the final stage, the clean-up and polishing preparation a writer goes through to present a text to their intended audience so they take it seriously. [See more on pp 306-317 of the *Norton Field Guide*.]

**Descriptive Reflection** →  **Dialogic Reflection** → **Critical Reflection**: in a **descriptive reflection** the writer points out and describes why and how they made particular rhetorical choices in their text; in a **dialogic reflection** the writer has “stepped back” from their writing and analyzes their rhetorical choices in relation to the particular goals and expectations for the assignment; in a **critical reflection** the writer synthesizes, draws connections between and evaluates the rhetorical choices they made in their text as compared to other texts they’ve written or read in this class or others in order to make an argument about their always-developing writerly selves. [See more on pp 245-252 of the *Norton Field Guide*.]

**Genre**: particular (and even peculiar) types of texts that have unique conventions, constraints and affordances and that serve certain rhetorical goals and purposes. They often exist within discourse communities as an accepted way of *doing* or engaging in a communicative act unique to that community (and/or across communities). Some examples are a proposal, a friendly letter, a blog, an academic article, or an essay. [See more on pp 271-278 of the *Norton Field Guide*.]

**Constraints**: the limitations of a genre within which student writers must learn to work.

**Affordances**: the allowances and possibilities of a genre which student writers can learn to wield with confidence.

**Multilinguistic**: Suggests that students bring a variety of English-*es* and languages to our classrooms and that we can seek ways to embrace and allow students to integrate these sociocultural and ethnolinguistic resources into their writing processes and products and for the purposes and audiences they deem appropriate to the rhetorical situation and writing task.

**Rhetorical Situation**: The context to which a text is responding; an awareness of the rhetorical situation surrounding a text or writing assignment means the writer has a particular **purpose** and **audience** in mind, a **stance** they are going to take, and an appropriate choice of **genre** to get that stance across to their audience for their specified purpose; it also includes a consideration of the **design** and **medium** of the text. [See more on pp 53-70 of the *Norton Field Guide*.]

**Summative Assessment**: offered on a students’ final text or end-of-term or -unit performance; compares it against some benchmark, outcome or standard.

**Formative Assessment**: used as a way to monitor student learning and offer feedback on writing-to-learn assignments or revision ideas on drafts.

BLANK RUBRIC TEMPLATE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Significant Evidence** | **Satisfactory Evidence** | **Partial Evidence** | **Negligible Evidence** |
| **Writerly Self-Awareness, Confidence & Voice** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **The Writing Process** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Critical Thinking, Metacognition and Reflection** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Developing Ideas & Synthesizing Those Ideas with New/Others’ Ideas** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Awareness of Genre & Language Conventions** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Awareness of Audience, Sense of Purpose for Texts** (Even Beyond the Classroom) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Connecting With & Getting to Know Students** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Descriptions of critical thinking adapted from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/critical-thinking/#DefiCritThin>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)