University of South Florida Academic Writing Scoring Criteria[1]

Criteria		Emerging 0	1	Developing 2	3	Mastering 4
Focus (25%)	Basics	Does not meet assignment requirements[2]		Partially meets assignment requirements		Meets assignment requirements
	Critical Thinking	Absent or weak thesis; ideas are underdeveloped, vague or unrelated to thesis; poor analysis of subject relevant to thesis		Predictable or unoriginal thesis; ideas are partially developed and related to thesis; inconsistent analysis of subject relevant to thesis		Insightful/intriguing thesis; ideas are convincing and compelling; cogent analysis of subject relevant to thesis
Evidence (25%)	Critical Thinking	Sources and supporting details lack credibility; poor synthesis of primary and secondary sources/evidence relevant to thesis; poor synthesis of visuals/personal experience/anecdotes relevant to thesis; rarely distinguishes between writer's ideas and source's ideas		Fair selection of credible sources and supporting details; unclear relationship between thesis and primary and secondary sources/evidence; ineffective synthesis of sources/evidence relevant to thesis; occasionally effective synthesis of visuals/personal experience/anecdotes relevant to thesis; inconsistently distinguishes between writer's ideas and source's ideas		Credible and useful sources and supporting details; cogent synthesis of primary and secondary sources/evidence relevant to thesis; clever synthesis of visuals/personal experience/anecdotes relevant to thesis; distinguishes between writer's ideas and source's ideas
Organization (25%)	Basics	Confusing opening; absent, inconsistent, or non-relevant topic sentences; few transitions and absent or unsatisfying conclusion		Uninteresting or somewhat trite introduction, inconsistent use of topic sentences, segues, transitions, and mediocre conclusion		Engaging introduction, relevant topic sentences, good segues, appropriate transitions, and compelling conclusion
	Critical Thinking	Illogical progression of supporting Points; lacks cohesiveness		Supporting points follow a somewhat logical progression; occasional wandering of ideas; some interruption of cohesiveness		Logical progression of supporting points; very cohesive
Style (20%)	Basics	Frequent grammar/punctuation errors; inconsistent point of view		Some grammar/punctuation errors occur in some places; somewhat consistent point of view		Correct grammar and punctuation; consistent point of view
	Critical Thinking	Significant problems with syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary		Occasional problems with syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary		Rhetorically-sound syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary; effective use of figurative language
Format (5%)	Basics	Little compliance with accepted documentation style (i.e., MLA, APA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, annotated bibliographies, and works cited; minimal attention to document design		Inconsistent compliance with accepted documentation (i.e., MLA, APA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, annotated bibliographies, and works cited; some attention to document design		Consistent compliance with accepted documentation (i.e., MLA, APA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, annotated bibliographies, and works cited; strong attention to document design

---

[1] This is a "living document"; in other words, we revise our scoring criteria in response to teacher and student feedback; see http://fyc.usf.edu for the latest version.

[2] A "0" for "Does not meet assignment requirements" results in an overall 0 (F) for the project.