MS-TESOL Comprehensive Exam Assessment Rubric

| Indicator | 0=does not meet | 1=approaches | 2=minimally meets | 3=meets | 4=exceeds |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| (a) Demonstrate an | The response refers | The response | The response | The response | The response |
| ability to respond to the | only superficially to | addresses only part of | addresses the | addresses the | demonstrates a precise |
| question or prompt | issues raised by the | the question, | question, but may | question directly | and exceptionally clear |
| directly and efficiently | question or misreads | wanders often to | wander at times off | and efficiently, | focus on the question or |
| | the question. | other topics, or is | of task or may omit | clarifying the key | prompt, illustrated a |
| | | mostly superficial in | key elements or | elements of the issue | highly nuanced |
| | | its treatment of the | nuance. | at hand and | command of the |
| | | question. | | consistently staying | relevant issues and |
| | | | | on-task. | elements. |
| (b) Apply analytical | The response applies | The response | The response | The response | The response |
| tools appropriately and | no analytical tools | includes some | includes sufficient | demonstrates | demonstrates a robust |
| consistently to support | and shows no | analysis and/or other | analysis and | appropriate and | and insightful |
| a clearly stated | evidence of field | forms of evidence, | argumentative | consistent use of | deployment of analytical |
| argument | appropriate | but not enough to | organization, but it | analytical tools, | tools and examples that |
| | argumentation. | support the | is marked by errors | organization, and | fully support a clear and |
| | | argument, or the | and weaknesses in | argumentation, | succinct argument. |
| | | argument is not | examples, analysis, | marked by few, if | |
| | | sufficiently clear to | or argumentation. | any, errors or | |
| | | determine whether it | | weaknesses. | |
| | | is supported. | | | |
| (c) Write in a style that | The response | The response | The response is | The response is | The response is written |
| is both clear and | contains many | contains some | written in a solid but | written in a style | in a style that enhances |
| appropriate to the | unclear passages, | unclear passages, | not impressive or | that both competent | the effectiveness and |
| related field of | choppy sentences, | choppy sentences, | sophisticated style, | and clear, with | clarity of the arguments |
| theoretical or applied | misspellings, and | misspellings, and | being marked by | features that make it | and that reflects a |
| linguistics | other stylistic | other stylistic | some stylistic | an appropriate | strong competence in |
| | problems, which | problems, which | problems and | contribution to the | the stylistic genre |
| | together make it | together weaken or | unclear passages | related field of | associated with the |
| | either completely or | obscure its clarity and | that weaken but do | theoretical or | related field of |
| | mostly unintelligible. | arguments. | not undermine the | applied linguistics. | theoretical or applied |
| | _ | _ | arguments. | | linguistics. |
| (d) Demonstrate | The response is | The response | The response | The response | The response |
| knowledge of theory | vague, inaccurate, or | demonstrates some | accurately presents | includes accurate | demonstrates a nuanced |
| and its development | grossly simplistic in | appropriate | the basics of | and detailed | and insightful |
| that is relevant to the | its use of theoretical | theoretical concepts | appropriate | theoretical concepts | understanding of how |
| question or prompt and | concepts and | and terminology, but | theoretical concepts | and terms, including | theoretical concepts |
| to the related field of | terminology. | the concepts and | and terms, but does | some nuance, that | and terms relate to the |

| theoretical or applied | | terms are not well | not provide much | demonstrate how | issues raised in the |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| linguistics | | used or are largely | depth and may | theory informs the | question. |
| | | inaccurate, vague, or | include some | issues raised in the | |
| | | overly general. | inaccuracies. | question. | |
| (e) Demonstrate | The response | The response refers | The response refers | The response | The response discusses |
| knowledge of | provides no evidence | only inaccurately or | somewhat to | includes an accurate | the implications of the |
| instructional | that the instructional | insubstantially to | implications of the | and substantive | question topic to |
| implications that are | implications of the | possible instructional | question topic for | discussion of the | instructional design and |
| relevant to the question | question topic have | implications of the | instructional design | instructional | assessment at a level |
| or prompt, including | been considered or | question topic. | or assessment of | implications of the | that is insightful, |
| instructional design | understood. | | leaner needs or | question topic. | detailed, and reflective of |
| and/or assessment | | | outcomes, but this | | the bidirectional |
| issues | | | component may be | | relationship between |
| | | | brief or somewhat | | theory and practice in |
| | | | inaccurate. | | TESOL. |