<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Conventions</th>
<th>3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB)</th>
<th>2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C)</th>
<th>1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rhetorical Negotiation of PURPOSE & AUDIENCE** | • Effectively expresses purpose in the introduction and thesis statement  
• Effectively addresses class and teacher w/in common conversation about literacy  
→ Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the text’s ideas | • Purpose of rhetorical analysis is discernable but not explicit  
• Addresses class and teacher w/in common conversation about literacy  
→ Readers are probably persuaded to consider the text’s ideas | • Vaguely expresses writer’s purpose in the intro  
• Gives little attention to audience  
→ Readers are confused and/or insulted and are not persuaded to consider the text’s ideas |
| **Organization/Logic** | • Employs thesis statement that focuses writer’s summative point (“strong response”) about the text being analyzed.  
• Appropriately addresses the three parts of the assignment: summary, rhetorical analysis, strong response  
• Employs logical sequence of connected §§  
→ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas | • Employs thesis statement that establishes some organization for the paper  
• Employs clear arrangement of §§  
→ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas | • Employs thesis statement that is formulaic or unrelated to the body §§  
• Employs confusing arrangement of §§  
→ Organization problems make it difficult for a reader to follow the text’s ideas |
| **Development** | • Effectively frames §§ around writer’s own points, which link to thesis  
• Effectively uses summary, paraphrase, and quotation from the analyzed text as evidence supporting those points  
• Effectively employs tactics of exposition | • Frames §§ around general statements  
• Uses summary, paraphrase, & quotation to describe the analyzed text rather than to support points about it  
• Employs tactics of exposition within paragraphs | • States general points that are vague, confusing, or unrelated to thesis; or presents paragraphs without point sentences  
• Paragraphs serve mainly to summarize the analyzed text  
→ Omits or uses confusing ¶ breaks |
| **Integrating Source Material** | • Uses smooth, clear attributive phrases and consistent MLA style parenthetical citations when referring to material from the text being analyzed or to any external material that is not common knowledge  
• Presents accurate MLA works cited list | • Uses attribution and internal MLA style citations with little awkwardness and few inconsistencies or errors  
• Presents competent MLA works cited list | • Omits many attributive phrases and uses few or unclear internal MLA citations  
• Relies extensively on quotations  
• Presents incomplete or inaccurate MLA works cited list |
| **Student Expert’s Ethos** | • Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of the content  
• Demonstrates personal engagement with the content (via the writer’s ideas, values, beliefs)  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as reliable and trustworthy | • Demonstrates general understanding of the content  
• Demonstrates some engagement with the content  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly unreliable | • Demonstrates little or no understanding of the content  
• Demonstrates little or no personal engagement with the content  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as unreliable |
| **Readability** | • Contains few or no errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation  
• Effectively uses sentences with clear subjects and verbs  
• Uses well-chosen vocabulary for an effective academic style | • Contains some distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or uses ineffective sentence structure, but these problems do not interfere with a reader’s comprehension  
• Uses largely appropriate academic word choices and style | • Contains numerous distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, some of which interfere with a reader’s understanding  
• Contains vocabulary choices that are confusing or inappropriate for an academic style |

FYE Program at Marquette University  
Rubric for Scoring English 1 – Unit 1, Rhetorical Analysis  

July 2009