### FYE Program at Marquette University

**Rubric for Scoring English 1 – Unit 3, Academic Argument**

<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** | - Uses intro effectively to define issue in a way that acknowledges competing perspectives
- Effectively asserts major claim in thesis statement and gives overview of argument (may be two sentences)
- Includes effective justification section
- Effectively addresses audience as part of common conversation about environmental issues but less informed on specific issue
  ➔ Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | - Defines issue in introduction in a way that acknowledges competing perspectives
- Uses thesis statement to present claim; overview of argument vague or missing
- Includes justification section
- Addresses audience as part of common conversation about environmental issues but less informed on specific issue
  ➔ Readers are probably persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | - Defines issue vaguely, without acknowledging competing perspectives
- Uses vague or no thesis statement, or thesis is not arguable
- Omits or gives little attention to justification section
- Gives little attention to audience
  ➔ Readers are confused and/or insulted and are not persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. |

| **Organization/Logic**      | - Effectively employs logical ¶ sequence to make and defend claim
- Effectively employs logical arrangement of ideas within each ¶
- Effectively employs conclusion that moves beyond summary toward action
  ➔ The organizational logic enhances a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas. | - Employs reasonably clear ¶ sequence
- Employs reasonably clear arrangement of ideas within each ¶
- Adequately employs conclusion that does more than summarize
  ➔ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas. | - Presents confusing arrangement of ¶s
- Presents confusing arrangement of ideas within each ¶
- Employs vague or summary conclusion
  ➔ The lack of purposeful organization makes it difficult for a reader to understand the text’s ideas. |

| **Development**             | - Effectively reasons to support thesis argument—making and defending a claim about a debatable issue
- Effectively uses body ¶s to support reasons w/ evidence from reasoning & research
- Smoothly integrates sources via summary, paraphrase, & quotation as needed | - Adequately employs reasoned argument—making and defending a claim about a debatable issue
- Adequately states writer’s reasons (general points) that support the thesis
- Adequately supports reasons w/ evidence fr. reasoning & research via summary, paraphrase, & quotation as needed | - Does not demonstrate reasoned argument
- States reasons that are vague, confusing, or unrelated to the thesis
- Employs little or no evidence |

| **Information Literacy**    | - Integrates effectively, summarizes and counters a pertinent opposing argument
- Effectively employs rhetorical analysis in discussion of all sources
- Uses clear attributive phrases and effectively credits sources with consistent internal MLA style parenthetical citations
- Presents accurate MLA works cited list | - Discusses opposing argument only briefly
- Contains evidence of rhetorical analysis
- Uses attribution, and credits sources with internal MLA style citations with only a few inconsistencies or errors
- Presents competent MLA works cited list | - Omits treatment of opposing argument
- Omits many attributive phrases and uses few or unclear MLA style citations
- Presents incomplete or inaccurate MLA works cited list |

---

Continued on the reverse
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT EXPERT’S ETHOS</strong></td>
<td>• Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of content</td>
<td>• Demonstrates general understanding of content</td>
<td>• Demonstrates little or no understanding of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates personal engagement with content via writer’s ideas, values, beliefs</td>
<td>• Demonstrates some personal engagement with the content</td>
<td>• Demonstrate little or no personal engagement content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as Trustworthy.</td>
<td>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly trustworthy.</td>
<td>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as not trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>READABILITY</strong></td>
<td>• Contains few or no errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure</td>
<td>• Contains some distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, but these errors do not interfere with comprehension</td>
<td>• Contains numerous distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, some of which interfere with a reader’s understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively uses sentences with clear subjects &amp; verbs, parallelism, transitions</td>
<td>• Includes sentence sequences that need transitions, parallel structure, and/or application of old-new contract principles</td>
<td>• Contains no evidence of attention to transitions, parallelism, or the old-new contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shows evidence of having attended to old-new contract to enhance readability</td>
<td>• Largely employs appropriate academic style</td>
<td>• Contains vocabulary choices confusing or inappropriate for an academic style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses well-chosen vocabulary for an effective academic style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>