# Scoring Rubric for Communication Foundations/Theory Question

| Candidate Proficiencies | Insufficient 1 | Emergent 2 | Proficient 3 | Distinguished 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CONCEPT | Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts with regard to theory | Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretative or conceptual errors or irrelevancies with regard to theory. | Responds well to the prompt; analysis goes beyond the obvious and explores the uses and value of theory | Comprehensively responds to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated and original; creates clear linkages between the centrality of theory to research |
| FOUNDATIONAL CONTENT | Explanation of theory/theories is inaccurate, vague, irrelevant or absent | Explanation of theory/theories is overly general and lacking depth | Explanation of theory/theories is clear, detailed, and accurate | Explanation of theory/theories is grounded, specific, arguable, and complex |
| LITERATURE | Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated | Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal | Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate | Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research and textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent |
| ORGANIZATION | Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transition, repetitive, wanders | Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions | Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs | Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs |
| LANGUAGE | Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning | Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); awkward syntax; wordiness | Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness | Scholarly and precise writing, syntactic variety, clear command of the language |

# Scoring Rubric for Communication Research Methods Question

| Candidate Proficiencies | Insufficient 1 | Emergent 2 | Proficient 3 | Distinguished 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Links Between Research Problem and Design | Provided no evidence to for a rationale of one's choice of research designs | Provided limited evidence of a rationale for one's choice of research designs | Made logical connections between one's chosen research designs and the research problem | Described how specific elements of research designs provide a unique justification for solving a research question |
| Research Design Links between Sampling Strategy and Research Design | Included no information to justify the sampling strategy | Included limited information to justify the sampling strategy | Included information to justify the sampling strategy | Described how the chosen sampling strategy strengthens decisions about one's choices of research designs |
| Methods, Measurement, & Procedures | Provided no rationale for the selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness | Provided limited rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness | Provided clear rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness | Provided very strong rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness |
| Data Analysis | Showed no understanding of appropriate use of the selected method | Showed limited understanding of appropriate use of the selected method | Showed understanding of appropriate use of the selected method | Showed advanced understanding of appropriate use of the selected method |
| Quality of Writing | Response is mechanically and rhetorically flawed | Response made some mechanical and rhetorical errors | Response is relatively free of mechanical and rhetorical errors | Response is well-written and has a strong rhetorical structure |

# Scoring Rubric for Communication Application Question

| Candidate Proficiencies | Insufficient 1 | Emergent 2 | Proficient 3 | Distinguished 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CONCEPT | Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts of the case example | Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors or irrelevancies | Responds well to the prompt analysis goes beyond the obvious | Responds comprehensively to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated, and original |
| APPLICATION TO PROBLEM /CASE | Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; provides limited evidence of critical thinking and problem-solving | Demonstrates minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates cursory critical thinking and problem-solving | Demonstrates acceptable proficiencies to describe, predict, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates critical thinking and problem-solving | Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in describing, predicting, or resolving the case or situation as presented; integrates scholarship in a way that demonstrates excellent critical thinking and problem-solving |
| LITERATURE | Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated | Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal | Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate | Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research or textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent |
| ORGANIZATION | Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transitions, repetitive, wanders | Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions | Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs | Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear, and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs |
| LANGUAGE | Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning | Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); occasional imprecise diction; awkward syntax; wordiness | Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness | Scholarly and precise use of language, clear command of the language |

*Assessment form and rubrics adapted from Widener University's Doctor of Education Program