

FYE Program at Marquette University
Rubric for Scoring English 1 – Unit 2, Academic Analysis & Synthesis

| Writing Conventions | 3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB) | 2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C) | 1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F) |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p><i>Rhetorical Negotiation of PURPOSE & AUDIENCE</i></p> <p>The written text...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively articulates purpose in the introduction and thesis statement in terms of surprising view and knowledge gap Effectively addresses audience as less informed than writer but part of the same conversation about global pop culture → Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announces subject matter in the introduction and/or thesis statement but purpose <i>re</i> surprising view and knowledge gap remains implicit Acknowledges audience as part of a conversation about global pop culture → Readers are probably persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vaguely expresses writer’s purpose in the intro; thesis is missing, vague, or only descriptive (“all about” writing) Lacks attention to surprising view or knowledge gap Gives little attention to audience → Readers are confused and/or insulted and are not persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. |
| <p>ORGANIZATION/LOGIC</p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employs writer’s ideas as main points Employs logical arrangement of ¶s Employs logical arrangement w/in ¶s by moving from points to particulars Effectively concludes the paper by moving beyond summary → The organizational logic enhances a reader’s understanding of writer’s points. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unevenly uses writer’s ideas as main pts Employs clear arrangement of ¶s Employs clear arrangement w/in ¶s but inconsistent in relationship between points and particulars Conclusion contains more than summary → The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of writer’s points. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focuses on readings, not writer’s ideas Employs confusing sequence of ¶s Employs confusing arrangement w/in ¶s Employs no conclusion or one that is a repetitive summary → Lack of clear organization makes it difficult for a reader to understand writer’s points. |
| <p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively employs summary and rhetorical analysis of readings Effectively states writer’s reasoning in support of the thesis Effectively states evidence, supporting writer’s thinking with textual references (via summary, paraphrase, & quotation) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employs more summary than analysis Adequately states and illustrates writer’s reasoning in support of the thesis Adequately states evidence, supporting writer’s thinking with textual references (via summary, paraphrase, & quotation) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not demonstrate rhetorical analysis of readings and contains too much summary Refers to readings but doesn’t connect them to writer’s thinking—minimal use of summary and paraphrase |
| <p>INFORMATION LITERACY</p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively focuses on 3 well-chosen texts, at least one w/ view fr. outside U.S. Uses clear attributive phrases and effectively credits sources with consistent internal MLA style parenthetical citations Presents accurate MLA works cited list | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses 3 readings, at least one w/ view from outside U.S. Uses attribution and credits sources with internal MLA style citations with only a few inconsistencies or errors Presents competent MLA works cited list | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses 3 readings unevenly, w/o adequate attention to view fr. outside U.S. Omits many attributive phrases and uses few or unclear MLA style citations Presents incomplete or inaccurate MLA works cited list |
| <p>STUDENT EXPERT’S ETHOS</p> <p>The written text employs an academic voice that...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates thorough understanding of content Demonstrates personal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as reliable and knowledgeable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates general understanding of content Demonstrates some personal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly reliable and knowledgeable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates minimal understanding of content Demonstrates minimal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as not particularly reliable or knowledgeable. |
| <p>READABILITY</p> <p>The written text...</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains few or no errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation or sentence structure (esp. subject position, active verbs, parallelism, and transitions) Uses well-chosen vocabulary and an employs an effective academic style | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains some distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, but these errors do not interfere with comprehension Employs a largely appropriate academic style | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, some interfering with a reader’s understanding Contains vocabulary choices confusing or inappropriate for an academic style |