# Writing Assessment Rubric Items and Generative AI Use

This document contains a selection of rubric items for assessing evidence of student learning with AI collaboration in mind. It is associated with the Hub Post, [AI Savvy Rubrics for Writing Assignments](https://tlconestoga.ca/ai-savvy-rubrics-for-writing-assignments/).

You may wish to use and adapt checklist items for a lower point value where criteria are not directly related to the course outcomes, where there may be a "false positive" using generative AI tools. Use analytic rubric items for a greater point value where criteria directly related to course outcomes. For more on rubrics, see [Rubric Quick Guide: Levels and Point Values](https://tlconestoga.ca/rubric-quick-guide-levels-and-point-values/).

## Discouraging or Minimizing AI Use in Assignments

These sample rubric items are designed to award grades for evidence of learning by the student without AI use.

### Checklist or Marking Scheme Rubric Items

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Suggests AI** | **Does Not Suggest AI** |
| Structural Patterns of AI-Generated Content | Submission contains excessive patterns typical of AI-generated content (e.g., lists, 3rd person, repetitive, removed structure) | Submission contains few or no structural patterns that suggest AI-generated content |
| Hallucinated (Missing or Falsified) Content | Answers are confidently made up; high quality answers go beyond course materials but have no sources; sources with links that lead nowhere; sources that are paywalled | Answers are qualified or nuanced; answers are specific; sources with active links; sources are accessible through the library or online |
| Artifacts of Tool Use | Prompt words or phrases indicate tool use (e.g., "Certainly!" or template language) | No artifacts of tool use; no prompt output content |
| Popular AI Terms | Submission contains a number of popular AI terms or terms are repeated (e.g., delve, mosaic, grapple, espouse, tapestry) | Submission contains few or no popular AI terms  |
| "Word Salad" | Phrases or sentences are semantically correct but are not meaningful in the English language | Phrases or sentences are meaningful in the English language |

### Analytic Rubric Items

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Incomplete** | **Needs improvement** | **Developing** | **Adequate** | **Strong** | **Outstanding** |
| Information Accuracy | Information is absent or entirely inaccurate.  | Multiple inaccuracies, hallucinations, outdated information, or biased content is evident. | The information in the submission is mostly accurate but contains multiple minor errors a significant error. | All information is accurate and free from hallucinations, outdated facts, or bias. | Information is accurate, well-researched, and presented in a clear and logical manner. | Information is exceptionally accurate, thoroughly researched, and presented in an engaging and insightful manner. |
| Verifiable References | References not included.  | Many references are fake, unverifiable, or not appropriately cited; sources are paywalled; links lead nowhere | Some references are real and verifiable, but there are issues with citation accuracy.  | Most references are real and verifiable, with minor citation errors that make it difficult to retrieve the source. | All references are real, verifiable, and appropriately cited. | References are not only real and verifiable but also diverse and highly relevant, with impeccable citation accuracy. |
| Connections to Course Materials | No connections to course materials are evident, or connections are inaccurate or fabricated | Limited connections to course materials are made, but they are not well-integrated or relevant. | An attempt to connect to course materials is made, but they are vague, unclear, or general | Adequate connections to course materials are made, showing some relevance and integration | Strong connections to course materials are made, showing clear relevance and integration. | Outstanding connections to course materials are made, demonstrating deep understanding and insightful integration. |
| Connection to Hyper Local Issue, Event, or Organization | No connection to issue or organization | Hallucinated or inaccurate information or connection to issue or organization | An attempt to provide connection to an issue or organization, but with some inaccurate or irrelevant information | Connection to hyper local issue or organization is made | Specific connections to hyper local issue or organization are made | Specific and highly appropriate connections to hyper local issue or organization are made |
| Evidence of Progression | No drafts or evidence of progression is submitted | Limited or incomplete evidence of progression is submitted, showing somewhat ambiguous development over time. | An attempt at a draft, outline, or research notes are made; a progress meeting is noted | Some drafts or evidence of progression in a draft, outline, or research notes are submitted, showing clear development of the work. | Multiple drafts or clear evidence of effort progression are submitted, showing significant development of the work. | Extensive drafts and comprehensive evidence of progression are submitted, demonstrating exceptional development and refinement of the work. |
| Language, Voice, Style | The language is semantically correct but is not meaningful in English, or is not in English. | The language is embellished, flowery, exaggerated, formulaic, and inauthentic. Some statements may be semantically correct but are not meaningful in English. Voice and style are banal. | The language shows some attempt at style, but it is inconsistent and lacks authenticity. Voice and style are uninspired. | The language is clear and functional, with some elements of style and authenticity. | The language is engaging, with a consistent and authentic voice and style. Voice and style are clear. | The language is exceptionally engaging, with a unique and authentic voice and style that enhances the content. Voice and style are engaging. |
| Emphasize contextual understanding, interpersonal nuances, and/or ethical awareness | No context described or accounted for | Minimal specificity of context, complexity of the situation, or nuance in the dilemma. | Some specificity of context and complexity of the situation is evident, but lacks depth. | Adequate specificity of context and complexity of the situation is evident, showing some understanding of the dilemma. | Strong specificity of context and complexity of the situation is evident, showing clear understanding of the dilemma. | Outstanding specificity of context and complexity of the situation is evident, demonstrating deep understanding and nuanced awareness of the dilemma. |
| Class activity or discussion synthesis | No evidence of ideas from class | Class activity or discussion is broadly but incorrectly described or struggles to be relevant to the argument or reflection | Class activity or discussion is broadly described, with limited relevance to the argument or reflection | Class activity or discussion is basically summarized, with some relevance to the argument or reflection | A specific idea from class activity or discussion is synthesized into the assignment to support the argument or reflection | Specific ideas from class activity or discussion are accurately synthesized into the assignment, enhancing and extending the argument or reflection |
| Application of Feedback | No feedback was provided due to lack of prior submission | Feedback from the professor is not applied. | Feedback is applied, but it is not clear where or how. | Feedback is applied in some areas, showing some improvement. | Feedback is applied effectively, showing clear improvement in the work. | Feedback is applied exceptionally well, demonstrating significant improvement and refinement of the work |

## Encouraging Collaborative or Assistive AI Use

### Checklist or Marking Scheme Rubric Items

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **No** | **Yes** |
| Compliance with AI Use Guidelines | The student did not follow the guidelines provided in the Instructional Plan and Course regarding appropriate use of AI | The student cited and disclaimed AI use and complied with all guidelines in the Instructional Plan and Course |
| Privacy and Security | Evidence of an AI tool other than Conestoga's Copilot was used | Conestoga's instance of Copilot was used |
| Disclosure of AI (e.g., citation, summary, appendix, checklist) | There is significant mismatch between the AI use and the student's disclosure of AI use | AI use is fully aligned with the student's disclosure of AI use, with no inconsistencies |

### Analytic Rubric Items

These sample rubric items are designed to award grades for evidence of learning through the student's responsible, balanced, and critical use of AI. Any of the rubric items in the "Discouraging AI Use" section may also to encourage the wise use of AI.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Incomplete** | **Needs improvement** | **Developing** | **Adequate** | **Strong** | **Outstanding** |
| Evidence of AI Use in the Assessment | Entirely structured as an AI output, with no apparent human intervention | An excessive amount of formatting with bold, italics, subheadings and lists  | Some over-structuring is still present, or traces of removed structure are still evident | Attempt have been made to avoid over-structuring or over-formatting, though evidence of removed structure may be evident  | Over-formatting has been removed; formatting is appropriate to the work | Formatting is appropriate and enhances or supports the meaning of the work |
| AI or Tool Citations and References | No AI or other required support tool was referenced and cited. | AI references were attempted, but it is unclear what is AI and what is human-written | An AI or other tool was referenced but not correctly or incompletely as per APA 7. | AI or other tool references are mostly correct, with minor citation errors as per APA 7. | AI or other tool references are correct and appropriately cited as per APA 7. | AI or tool references are exceptionally well-documented, with impeccable citation accuracy and relevance |
| Critical Reflection on Use of Tools to Develop Work | No reflection submitted | Reflection that is embellished and exaggerated, not reflecting the quality of the work. | Reflection is vague and general, with occasional embellished or exaggerated language. | Reflection is clear and relevant, showing some understanding of the implications of tools used. | Reflection is insightful and well-articulated, showing a strong understanding of tool use and ethical implications. | Reflection is exceptionally insightful and nuanced, demonstrating a deep understanding of tool use, its ethical implications, and its impact on the work |
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