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