

FYE Program at Marquette University
Rubric for Scoring English 1 – Unit 3, Academic Argument

Writing Conventions	3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB)	2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C)	1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F)
<p><i>Rhetorical Negotiation of</i> PURPOSE & AUDIENCE</p> <p>The written text...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>ORGANIZATION/LOGIC <small>See ABGW 457.</small></p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectively employs 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not demonstrate reasoned argument • States reasons that are vague, confusing, or unrelated to the thesis • Employs little or no evidence
<p>INFORMATION LITERACY</p> <p>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

FYE Program at Marquette University
Rubric for Scoring English 1 – Unit 3, Academic Argument

Writing Conventions	3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB)	2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C)	1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F)
<p>STUDENT EXPERT’S ETHOS the written text employs an academic voice that...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of content • Demonstrates personal engagement with content via writer’s ideas, values, beliefs → Readers perceive this textual voice as Trustworthy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates general understanding of content • Demonstrates some personal engagement with the content → Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly trustworthy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates little or no understanding of content • Demonstrate little or no personal engagement content → Readers perceive this textual voice as not trustworthy.
<p>READABILITY The written text...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains few or no errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure • Effectively uses sentences with clear subjects & verbs, parallelism, transitions • Shows evidence of having attended to old-new contract to enhance readability • Uses well-chosen vocabulary for 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 • Includes sentence sequences that need transitions, parallel structure, and/or application of old-new contract principles • Largely employs appropriate academic style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains numerous distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, some of which interfere with a reader’s understanding • Contains no evidence of attention to transitions, parallelism, or the old-new contract • Contains vocabulary choices confusing or inappropriate for an academic style