

**First-Year English Program at Marquette University**  
**Rubric for Scoring English 2 – Unit 2, News Literacy**

<b>WRITING CONVENTIONS</b>	<b>3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB)</b>	<b>2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C)</b>	<b>1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F)</b>
<p><b><i>Rhetorical Negotiation of PURPOSE &amp; AUDIENCE</i></b></p> <p><i>The written text...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectively expresses via introduction &amp; thesis statement the assigned purpose of evaluating coverage of an event by multiple U.S. &amp; international news media</li> <li>• Effectively develops the argument by applying clearly articulated evaluative criteria based on the unit’s readings about good quality journalism</li> <li>• Effectively yet briefly provides needed contextual information <i>re</i> the event and the news sources under discussion</li> <li>• Effectively addresses class and teacher w/in common conversation about the reliability of news reports</li> <li>→ Readers are definitely persuaded to consider the student’s ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expresses in introduction and/or thesis statement the assigned purpose of evaluating coverage of an event by multiple U.S. and international news media</li> <li>• Develops the argument by applying explicit evaluative criteria based on the unit’s readings about good quality journalism</li> <li>• Provides needed contextual information regarding the event and the news sources under discussion</li> <li>• Addresses class and teacher as part of common conversation about the reliability of news reports</li> <li>→ Readers are probably persuaded to consider the student’s ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vaguely expresses the assigned purpose of evaluating coverage of an event by multiple U.S. and international news media—thesis perhaps unclear, missing, or purely descriptive</li> <li>• Uses vaguely expressed or overly generalized evaluative criteria with minimal reference to the unit’s readings</li> <li>• Provides inadequate contextual information regarding the event and news sources under discussion OR devotes too much space to summarizing the event</li> <li>• Gives too little attention to unit readings and discussion <i>re</i> journalistic reliability</li> <li>→ Readers are not persuaded to consider the text’s ideas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ORGANIZATION/LOGIC</b></p> <p><i>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectively employs thesis statement that makes an evaluative claim about the quality of coverage across media outlets and indicates criteria used for the evaluation</li> <li>• Employs logical arrangement of ¶s</li> <li>• Employs logical arrangement of ideas within paragraphs</li> <li>• Employs effective introduction and conclusion, which moves beyond summary</li> <li>→ The organizational logic enhances a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents thesis statement with evaluative claim about quality of coverage across media outlets and indicates criteria used for the evaluation</li> <li>• Employs clear arrangement of ¶s</li> <li>• Employs clear arrangement of ideas within most paragraphs</li> <li>• Employs a clear introduction and conclusion, which moves beyond summary</li> <li>→ The organizational logic assists a reader’s understanding of the text’s ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks thesis statement connecting to the evaluative assignment, and/or presents thesis that neglects to indicate criteria used for the evaluation</li> <li>• Employs confusing arrangement of ¶s</li> <li>• Employs confusing arrangement of ideas within most paragraphs</li> <li>• Employs formulaic introduction and conclusion disconnected from evaluative purpose of the paper</li> <li>→ Organization problems make it difficult for reader to understand text’s ideas.</li> </ul>

Remaining three categories are on opposite side/next page:  
**Development, Readability, Information Literacy**

<b>WRITING CONVENTIONS</b>	<b>3 – Proficient Outcome (A, AB)</b>	<b>2 – Competent Outcome (B, BC, C)</b>	<b>1 – Developing Outcome (CD, D, F)</b>
<p><b>DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p><i>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively supports thesis claim with body paragraphs explaining the criteria-match process the writer is using to evaluate the news reports under discussion: See framework on ABGW 439</li> <li>Effectively develops body paragraphs from clear point sentences that state writer’s reasoning in writer’s own words</li> <li>Effectively uses summary, paraphrase, and quotation to present detailed evidence illustrating and elaborating upon the writer’s criteria-match points</li> <li>Effectively summarizes and responds to anticipated objections to criteria or matches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequately supports thesis claim with body paragraphs explaining the criteria-match process the writer is using to evaluate the news reports under discussion: See framework on ABGW 439</li> <li>Adequately develops body paragraphs from clear point sentences that state writer’s reasoning in writer’s own words</li> <li>Adequately uses summary, paraphrase, and quotation to present detailed evidence illustrating and elaborating upon the writer’s criteria-match points</li> <li>Adequately summarizes and responds to anticipated objections to criteria or matches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks support for thesis claim because body paragraphs do not adequately explain the criteria-match process the writer is using to evaluate the news reports under discussion: See framework on ABGW 439</li> <li>Presents body paragraphs without clear point sentences stating writer’s reasoning in writer’s own words</li> <li>Lacks adequate evidence to illustrate and elaborate upon writer’s criteria-match points; details too frequently function as description or summary, not evidence</li> <li>Lacks adequate summary or response to anticipated objections to criteria or matches</li> <li>Omits or uses confusing ¶ breaks</li> </ul>
<p><b>WRITER’S ETHOS</b></p> <p><i>Given the purpose and audience, the written text employs a textual voice that...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates confident, authoritative understanding of the assigned evaluative purpose and content</li> <li>Demonstrates personal engagement with purpose &amp; content (via the writer’s ideas, insights, values, beliefs)</li> <li>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as trustworthy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates general understanding of the assigned evaluative purpose and content</li> <li>Demonstrates some personal engagement with purpose &amp; content (via the writer’s ideas, insights, values, beliefs)</li> <li>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as mostly trustworthy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates little or no understanding of the assigned evaluative purpose and content</li> <li>Demonstrates little or no personal engagement with purpose and content (via the writer’s ideas, insights, values, beliefs)</li> <li>→ Readers perceive this textual voice as untrustworthy or unconvincing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>READABILITY</b></p> <p><i>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains few or no errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure</li> <li>Effectively uses sentences with clear subjects &amp; verbs, parallelism, &amp; transitions</li> <li>Shows evidence of having attended to old-new contract to enhance readability</li> <li>Uses well-chosen vocabulary for an effective academic style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains some distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, but they do not interfere with a reader’s understanding</li> <li>Needs clearer subject-verb sequences, parallel structures, or explicit transitions to enhance clarity</li> <li>Needs application of old-new contract principles to enhance readability</li> <li>Largely employs appropriate academic vocabulary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains numerous distracting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, or sentence structure, some of which interfere with a reader’s understanding</li> <li>Contains little or evidence of attention to subject-verb sequence, parallelism, or transitions</li> <li>Contains little or evidence of attention to the old-new contract</li> <li>Contains vocabulary choices confusing or inappropriate for an academic style</li> </ul>
<p><b>INFORMATION LITERACY</b></p> <p><i>Given the purpose and audience, the written text...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has effectively chosen news sources that fit guidelines in unit assignment</li> <li>Provides access to all five news sources via the Web or clearly labeled paper copy in portfolio</li> <li>Effectively employs rhetorical analysis in discussion of texts</li> <li>Provides clear, accurate attribution and effectively credits sources via consistent internal APA style parenthetical citations</li> <li>Presents thorough and accurate APA references list with few or no errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has chosen news sources adequate for unit assignment</li> <li>Provides access to all five news sources via the Web or clearly labeled paper copy in portfolio</li> <li>Devotes some attention to rhetorical analysis in discussion of texts</li> <li>Provides attribution and credits sources via internal APA style parenthetical citation with few inconsistencies or errors</li> <li>Presents competent APA references list with format errors only, no content errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has chosen news sources inadequate for a competent approach to the assignment</li> <li>Does not provide adequate access to all five news sources via Web or clearly labeled paper copy in portfolio</li> <li>Includes little or no attention to rhetorical analysis in discussion of texts</li> <li>Includes too few attributive phrases and/or uses too few, unclear, inconsistent, or inaccurate APA style parenthetical citations</li> <li>Presents incomplete, incorrectly formatted, or inaccurate APA references list</li> </ul>