LSU Integrative Learning Core (ILC)
Proficiency: Written Communication

Proficiency Dimensions	Core Assessment (performance indicators are based on the rigor of the discipline)				Graduating Assessment
Description	Four levels of performance intended for 1000 and 2000 level courses approved as ILC courses. The 'meeting' level of performance is LSU benchmark for the ILC curriculum.				The capstone level of performance is LSU benchmark for graduating seniors.
	NOT APPROACHING 0	**APPROACHING 1**	**MEETING 2**	**EXCEEDING 3**	**CAPSTONE 4**
Context and Purpose					Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.
Content Development					Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.
Genre and Conventions					Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices
Sources and Evidence					Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing
Syntax and Mechanics					Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.

LSU Adapted – AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric

Definition
Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Framing Language
    This writing rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of educational institutions. The most clear finding to emerge from decades of research on writing assessment is that the best writing assessments are locally determined and sensitive to local context and mission. Users of this rubric should, in the end, consider making adaptations and additions that clearly link the language of the rubric to individual campus contexts.
    This rubric focuses assessment on how specific written work samples or collectios of work respond to specific contexts. The central question guiding the rubric is "How well does writing respond to the needs of audience(s) for the work?" In focusing on this question the rubric does not attend to other aspects of writing that are equally important: issues of writing process, writing strategies, writers' fluency with different modes of textual production or publication, or writer's growing engagement with writing and disciplinarity through the process of writing.
    Evaluators using this rubric must have information about the assignments or purposes for writing guiding writers' work. Also recommended is including reflective work samples of collections of work that address such questions as: What decisions did the writer make about audience, purpose, and genre as s/he compiled the work in the portfolio? How are those choices evident in the writing -- in the content, organization and structure, reasoning, evidence, mechanical and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate
    The first section of this rubric addresses the context and purpose for writing. A work sample or collections of work can convey the context and purpose for the writing tasks it showcases by including the writing assignments associated with work samples. But writers may also convey the context and purpose for their writing within the texts. It is important for faculty and institutions to include directions for students about how they should represent their writing contexts and purposes.
    Faculty interested in the research on writing assessment that has guided our work here can consult the National Council of Teachers of English/Council of Writing Program Administrators' White Paper on Writing Assessment (2008; www.wpacouncil.org/whitepaper) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication's Writing Assessment: A Position Statement (2008; www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/123784.htm)

Glossary
Content Development: The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.
Context of and purpose for writing: The context of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is reading it? who is writing it? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.
Disciplinary conventions: Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer's purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.
Evidence: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.
Genre conventions: Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.
Sources: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level 1 performance.

	Not Approaching 0	Approaching 1	Meeting 2 (CORE ASSESSMENT BENCHMARK)	Exceeding 3	Capstone 4 (GRADUATING ASSESSMENT BENCHMARK)
Context and Purpose	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.
Content Development	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.
Genre and Conventions	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices
Sources and Evidence	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing
Syntax and Mechanics	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.

LSU Adapted – AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric