<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 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. | • Announces subject matter in the introduction and/or thesis statement but purpose re 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. | • 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. |
| Organization/Logic | Given the purpose and audience, the written text… | • 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. | • 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. | • 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. |
| Development | Given the purpose and audience, the written text… | • 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) | • 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) | • 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 |
| Information Literacy | Given the purpose and audience, the written text… | • 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 | • 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 | • Discusses 3 readings unevenly, w/o adequate attention to all three.  
• Omits many attributive phrases and uses few or unclear MLA style citations  
• Presents incomplete or inaccurate MLA works cited list |
| Student Expert’s Ethos | The written text employs an academic voice that… | • Demonstrates thorough understanding of content  
• Demonstrates personal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as reliable and knowledgeable. | • Demonstrates general understanding of content  
• Demonstrates some personal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly reliable and knowledgeable. | • Demonstrates minimal understanding of content  
• Demonstrates minimal engagement with content → Readers perceive this textual voice as not particularly reliable or knowledgeable. |
| Readability | The written text… | • 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 | • 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 | • 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 |