<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W R I T I N G  C O N V E N T I O N S</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**  
**Purpose & Audience**  
*The written text…* | • Effectively expresses via introduction & thesis statement assigned purpose to analyze and interpret the rhetorical impact of narrative and cultural elements in two visual texts w/ “common denominator”  
• Effectively shows how analyzing the two visuals together reveals cultural and narrative dimensions and rhetorical purposes of each  
• Effectively addresses class and teacher w/in common conversation about visual rhetoric and narrative  
→ Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the student’s ideas. | • Expresses in introduction and/or thesis statement assigned purpose to analyze and interpret the rhetorical impact of narrative and cultural elements in two visual texts  
• Connects rhetorical effect of narrative and cultural elements in one text to those of the other  
• Addresses class and teacher as part of common conversation about visual rhetoric and narrative  
→ Readers are probably persuaded to consider the student’s ideas. | • Vaguely expresses assigned purpose to analyze and interpret the rhetorical impact of narrative and cultural elements in two visual texts—thesis unclear, missing, or purely descriptive  
• Ignores or inadequately develops rhetorical effect of narrative & cultural elements; discussion relies primarily on formal description of the visual texts  
• Gives little attention to conversation and experience shared with audience  
→ Readers are not persuade to consider the text’s ideas. |
| **Organization/Logic**  
*Given the purpose and audience,  
the written text…* | • Employs thesis statement that responds specifically to the interpretive assignment, focuses the paper, and forecasts paper’s organization  
• Employs logical arrangement of ¶s  
• Employs logical arrangement of ideas within paragraphs  
• Employs effective introduction and conclusion, which moves beyond summary  
→ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas. | • Employs thesis statement that connects with the interpretive assignment, provides focus, and suggests an organizational logic for the paper  
• Employs clear arrangement of ¶s  
• Employs clear arrangement of ideas within most paragraphs  
• Employs a clear introduction and conclusion  
→ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas. | • Lacks thesis statement connecting to the interpretive assignment, or lacks focus that connects to body of the paper  
• Employs confusing arrangement of ¶s  
• Employs confusing arrangement of ideas within most paragraphs  
• Employs formulaic introduction and conclusion disconnected from interpretive purpose of the paper  
→ Organization problems make it difficult for reader to understand text’s ideas. |
| **Development**  
*Given the purpose and audience,  
the written text…* | • Effectively develops body paragraphs centered on writer’s own general points, which serve as reasons supporting the thesis  
• Effectively supports/develops these points with details about the visual texts derived from personal observation, ideas in source texts, and external research | • Adequately centers body paragraphs on statements of writer’s own general points, which support the thesis  
• Adequately supports/develops these points with details about the visual texts derived from personal observation, ideas in source texts, and external research | • States general points that are vague, confusing, or unrelated to thesis; or presents paragraphs without point sentences  
• Presents details that function as description or summary, but not as evidence  
• Or provides too few supporting details  
• Omits or uses confusing ¶ breaks |
| **Writer’s Ethos**  
*Given the purpose and audience,  
the written text employs a textual voice that…* | • Demonstrates confident, authoritative understanding of the assigned interpretive purpose and content  
• Demonstrates personal engagement with purpose & content (via the writer’s ideas, insights, values, beliefs)  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as trustworthy. | • Demonstrates general understanding of the assigned interpretive purpose and content  
• Demonstrates some personal engagement with purpose & content (via the writer’s ideas, insights, values, beliefs)  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly trustworthy. | • Demonstrates little or no understanding of the assigned interpretive purpose and content  
• Demonstrates little or no personal engagement with purpose and content  
→ Readers perceive this textual voice as untrustworthy or unconvincing |
## First-Year English Program at Marquette University

**Rubric for Scoring English 2 – Unit 1, Visual Literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>READABILITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</strong></th>
<th><strong>INFOMATION LITERACY</strong></th>
<th><strong>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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>• Needs clearer subject-verb sequences, parallel structures, or explicit transitions to enhance clarity</td>
<td>• Contains little or evidence of attention to subject-verb sequence, parallelism, transitions, or the old-new contract to enhance clarity and readability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shows evidence of having attended to old-new contract to enhance readability</td>
<td>• Needs application of old-new contract principles to enhance readability</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 style</td>
<td>• Largely employs appropriate academic style</td>
<td>• Addresses need for information from external sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively addresses need for information from external sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectively employs rhetorical analysis in discussion of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides attribution and credits sources via internal APA style parenthetical citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes too few attributive phrases and uses few or unclear APA citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents incomplete or incorrectly formatted APA references list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes the visual texts under discussion without attention to APA formatting, or fails to include them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides clear attributive phrases and effectively credits sources via consistent internal APA style parenthetical citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents thorough and accurate APA references list with few or no errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes the visual texts under discussion but without good APA format and captions for visual figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contains the visual texts under discussion without attention to APA formatting, or fails to include them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presents the visual texts under discussion with conventional APA format and captions for visual figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes the visual texts under discussion with poor APA format and captions for visual figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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