

Courtesy of Nishani Singh, Faculty of Professions, University of Adelaide
Rubrics for Business Communications Course
Writing Assessment Profile

Content (30)			
Very good to excellent 27-30	Good to very good 22-26	Satisfactory 16-21	Unsatisfactory 0-15
<p>Author has a thorough understanding of concepts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content is factually correct and various interpretations are provided 2. Level and depth of content is appropriate 3. Content is focussed and contains only relevant information 4. Main argument is strongly supported by references, which are effectively integrated 5. Critically analyses and makes valid judgements, compares perspectives of different authors 6. Expresses clear opinions on issues, demonstrates creativity 	<p>Author has a good understanding of concepts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content is factually correct and an interpretation is provided 2. Level and depth of content is appropriate 3. Content is focussed and contains only relevant information 4. Main argument is supported by references 5. Critically analyses and makes valid judgements 	<p>Author has a basic understanding of concepts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content is factually correct, may contain some interpretation 2. Level and depth of content is usually appropriate 3. Content is usually focussed but may contain irrelevant information 4. Argument is usually supported by references 	<p>Author does not understand material</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content contains many factual errors 2. No interpretation provided 3. Level and depth of content is inappropriate 4. Content is not focused and contains irrelevant material

Organisation (25)			
Very good to excellent 22-25	Good to very good 18-21	Satisfactory 11 – 17	Unsatisfactory 0-10
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is linked to the body of the assignment and the main argument of the text 2. The body of the text and the development of the argument follows a logical sequence 3. Conclusion summarises main argument and raises further issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is linked to the body of the text 2. The body of the text and the development of the argument follows a logical sequence 3. Conclusion summarises main argument 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is linked to the body of the text 2. The body of the text follows a logical sequence 3. Conclusion summarises main argument 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction may be absent or poorly linked to the body of the text 2. The body of the text does not follow a logical sequence 3. Conclusion is absent or does not summarise main argument

Language use (20)			
Very good to excellent 18-20	Good to very good 14-17	Satisfactory 11-13	Unsatisfactory 0-10
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple constructions used, without error. 2. Complex constructions used predominantly, usually without error 3. Meaning is communicated by varied sentence structures 4. Sophisticated use of extensive vocabulary 5. Appropriate register, no errors in word order 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple constructions used, without error. 2. Complex constructions used, usually without error 3. Meaning is communicated by varied sentence structures 4. Good use of broad vocabulary 5. Appropriate register, no errors in word order 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple constructions used, usually without error. 2. Complex constructions attempted 3. Meaning is communicated by basic sentence structures 4. A good vocabulary is used 5. Appropriate register, word order usually correct 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple constructions used with frequent errors 2. Sentence structures do not communicate meaning 3. Poor use of a limited vocabulary 4. Inappropriate register, word order usually incorrect

References (20)			
Very good to excellent 18-20	Good to very good 14-17	Satisfactory 11-13	Unsatisfactory 0-10
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective and appropriate use of reporting verbs 2. All claims made are acknowledged by using in- text referencing 3. Harvard System is used to cite sources 4. Reference list is formatted accurately and ordered alphabetically 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reporting verbs always used 2. In-text referencing usually used 3. Harvard System is used to cite sources 4. Reference list is formatted accurately and ordered alphabetically 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reporting verbs usually used 2. Some in-text referencing 3. Harvard System is usually used to cite sources 4. Reference list is usually formatted accurately and is ordered alphabetically 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No use of reporting verbs 2. No in-text referencing 3. Harvard System is not used to cite sources 4. Reference list is not formatted or ordered accurately

Mechanics (5)			
Very good to excellent 5	Good to very good 4	Satisfactory 3	Unsatisfactory 0-2
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Few errors of conventions for agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation ,capitalisation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Occasional errors of conventions for agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation, capitalisation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Frequent errors of conventions for agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation, capitalisation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Text dominated by errors of conventions for agreement, tense, number, articles, pronouns, prepositions, spelling, punctuation, capitalisation