PTE Essay Exam Scoring Rubric

Copyright 2005 Illinois State University Physics Teacher Education Program

Your essay exams in this course will be evaluated using the following scoring rubric. Your essay responses should be well organized, properly presented, and reflect critical thinking. As such essays will satisfy the following criteria:

	0 points (failing)	1 point (poor)	2 points (fair)	3 points (good)	pts
Professionalism (addend)	Unprofessional; provides mostly general commentary and personal opinions; strong evidence of "surface learning."	Less professional; some material of substance, but lots of personal commentary; shows more "surface learning" than "deep learning."	More professional; material mostly of substance, but includes some opinions; shows more "deep learning" than "surface learning."	Very professional; material of substantive value; research based; no needed improvement; strong evidence of "deep learning."	
Clarity (addend)	Poorly written; a number of major and minor grammatical errors; essentially unreadable; paragraphs are a jumble of sentences and sentences are a jumble of words; gibberish; key points missing and/or not elaborated.	Tolerably well written; a fair number of minor grammatical errors; a few major errors; confusing to reader; no evidence of regular review and revision; key points are made, but not often elaborated.	Reasonably well written; a few minor grammatical errors; easy and interesting reading; evidence of regular revision and proof reading; key points are made, but not always elaborated.	Well written; no grammatical errors; easy and interesting reading; clear evidence of regular revision & proofing; key ideas are fully elaborated and illustrate what is meant; examples are provided as appropriate.	
Accuracy (addend)	Multiple and gross errors in fact; grossly inaccurate conclusions.	Multiple minor errors in fact; poorly-drawn conclusions.	Minor errors in fact; reasonably well drawn conclusions.	No discernable errors in fact; well-grounded conclusions.	
Precision (addend)	Makes broad statements of generalities; provides no details and no supporting evidence for claims.	Mostly broad generalities, a few concise statements; very limited use of supporting evidence.	Mostly concise statements but a few broad generalities; moderate use of supporting evidence.	Makes concise statements rather than broad generalities; provides details; provides substantial evidence.	
Relevance (addend)	Arguments are not cogent, concise, and relevant; few arguments are given and they are poorly reasoned, and insufficient to the task.	Arguments are not always cogent, concise, and relevant; many arguments are given but they are poorly reasoned.	Most arguments are cogent, concise, and relevant; a small number of arguments provided and all are well reasoned.	All statements are relevant to the topic or bear on the question at hand; assists in clarifying topic or resolving issue.	
Depth (addend)	Address few if any of the main factors that make this topic important; clearly lacks evidence of appropriate knowledge of resources.	Addresses some of the main factors that make this topic important; shows some evidence of knowledge of resources.	Addresses most of the main factors that make this topic important; shows considerable evidence of knowledge of several resources.	Fully addresses main factors that make the topic important; deals with complexities; identifies difficulties; shows evidence of thorough knowledge of major critical resources.	
Breadth (addend)	Addresses full range of subject matter poorly; provides biased alternative perspectives.	Addresses full range of subject matter irregularly; provides no or incorrect alternative perspectives.	Addresses full range of subject matter adequately; includes other important perspectives if pertinent to topic.	Addresses full range of subject matter very thoroughly; includes multiple important perspectives if pertinent to topic.	
Logic (addend)	Logic flawed; draws inappropriate conclusions from data or draws conclusions without supporting data; garbled presentation; lacks logical flow of presentation.	Logic weak, perhaps flawed, but attempts to draw appropriate conclusions from the limited amount of data provided; somewhat disorganized presentation of information.	Fairly good use of logic; provides good data, but perhaps draws improper conclusions on the basis of that data; orderly presentation of information and arguments.	Arguments provided are all well reasoned, "win the day" and make sense; conclusions flow from evidence; order of presentation suggests use of a mental outline.	
Spelling, and Punctuation (addend)	Numerous spelling and/or punctuation errors.	A modest number of spelling and punctuation errors.	No spelling errors, and only a few punctuation errors.	Insignificant number of punctuation errors; no spelling errors.	
General Comments:				**Total Raw Points:**	
					27
				Percentage:	