<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 lay out a problem in need of solution  
• Effectively asserts major claim in thesis statement and gives overview of argument (may be two sentences)  
• Includes effective justification section (consequences/values/perhaps analogy or precedent)  
• Effectively addresses audience as part of common conversation about finding solutions but less informed on specifics  
→ Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | • Introduces paper with reference to addressing a problem  
• Uses thesis statement to present claim; overview of argument vague or missing  
• Includes partial justification section (see description under “proficient”)  
• Addresses audience as part of common conversation about finding solutions but less informed on specifics  
→ Readers are probably persuaded to consider the text’s ideas. | • Defines problem/solution vaguely  
• Uses vague or no thesis statement, or thesis is not arguable  
• Omits or gives little attention to justification section  
• Inconsistent attention to audience re engagement or information needs  
→ Readers are likely confused and 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 the text’s persuasiveness. | • Employs reasonably clear ¶ sequence  
• Employs somewhat clear arrangement of ideas within each ¶  
• Adequately employs conclusion that does more than summarize  
→ The organizational logic does not interfere with the text’s persuasiveness. | • Presents confusing arrangement of ¶s  
• Presents confusing arrangement of ideas within each ¶  
• Employs vague or summary conclusion  
→ The lack of purposeful organization interferes with persuasiveness |
| **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 sources  
• Smoothly integrates evidence via summary, paraphrase, & quotation as needed | • Adequately employs reasoned argument—making and defending a claim about a debatable issue  
• Adequately states general reasons in support of thesis  
• Adequately supports reasons w/ evidence fr. sources via summary, paraphrase, & quotation as needed | • Does not demonstrate reasoned argument  
• States reasons that are vague, confusing, or disconnected from the thesis  
• Employs material from sources w/o explaining connections or reasoning, relying primarily on descriptive summary |
| **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 discussion of opposing argument  
• Omits many attributive phrases and uses few or unclear MLA style citations  
• Presents incomplete or inaccurate MLA works cited list |

**August 2012**

Continued on the reverse
# FYE Program at Marquette University

## Rubric for Scoring English 1001 – 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>
| **STUDENT EXPERT’S ETHOS** | • Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of content  
• Demonstrates personal engagement with content via writer’s ideas, values, beliefs  
→ Readers perceive the authorial ethos as trustworthy. | • Demonstrates general understanding of content  
• Demonstrates some personal engagement with the content  
→ Readers perceive the authorial ethos as mostly trustworthy. | • Demonstrates little or no understanding of content  
• Demonstrates little or no personal engagement content  
→ Readers do not perceive this authorial ethos as trustworthy. |
| **READABILITY** | • 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 | • 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 | • 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 |