

OPINION EDITORIAL RUBRIC—WRITING 150

ARGUMENT

<i>OOPS!</i>	<i>developing toward expectations</i>	<i>meeting expectations</i>	<i>exceeding expectations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue is unclear and/or is not timely (<i>kairos</i>) ▪ Incorrectly identifies the appropriate audience and/or may alienate the audience ▪ The argument seems weak because the author does not establish his or her credibility ▪ Evokes an emotion in the audience that seems to work against the author (<i>pathos</i>) ▪ Claims are unsupported (logos)Counterarguments are ignored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue is evident but may not be timely or defined clearly (<i>kairos</i>) ▪ Addresses the appropriate audience, though the writer might misread the audience and/or does not address the audience's needs ▪ Claims are unevenly supported, and reasons may be either insufficient or weak (<i>logos</i>) ▪ Attempts to establish credibility, although attempts don't achieve their aim (<i>ethos</i>) ▪ Attempts to evoke emotion in the audience, although attempts don't achieve their aim (<i>pathos</i>) ▪ Counterarguments are anticipated, though not responded to convincingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defines a timely and engaging issue ▪ Identifies and addresses the appropriate audience, but perhaps does not fully meet audience's needs ▪ The writer successfully makes moves towards establishing credibility with a few exceptions (<i>ethos</i>) ▪ Claims are well supported, though reasons may not be completely compelling or assumptions considered (<i>logos</i>) ▪ For the most part, the author effectively evokes the appropriate emotion in the audience (<i>pathos</i>) ▪ Counterarguments are anticipated, though the response may not be sufficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly defines a timely and engaging issue (<i>kairos</i>) ▪ Effectively identifies and persuasively addresses the appropriate audience and its needs ▪ The writer establishes his/her credibility (<i>ethos</i>) ▪ Fully supports claims with sound reasons and evidence (<i>logos</i>) ▪ Effectively evokes the appropriate emotion in the audience (<i>pathos</i>) ▪ Effectively responds to counter arguments (<i>procatalepsis</i>)
[-----]			

ORGANIZATION

<i>OOPS!</i>	<i>developing toward expectations</i>	<i>meeting expectations</i>	<i>exceeding expectations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ rudimentary title without a focus; introduction is boring and/or fails to announce the focus of the editorial; conclusion is unsatisfactory ▪ lacks focus and development ▪ transitions and topic sentences are rough, unclear, or missing and leave the audience confused about the focus of the paper ▪ consistent errors in MLA formatting considerably impede the reader's understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ title and introduction may be uninteresting, unclear, or too broad, although the focus becomes apparent as the editorial unfolds; conclusion is merely a reiteration of the argument ▪ is not fully focused; may occasionally introduce information unrelated to the main idea; some paragraphs don't seem to support or develop the thesis ▪ transitions and topic sentences may be weak, unclear, or do not meet the purposes of the paragraph ▪ errors in MLA formatting appear with some frequency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ title lacks verve, but it works well; the introduction works well but may not capture our attention, and the conclusion summarizes the argument well but may not suggest implications that answer the question, "so what"? ▪ has a single focus, with some straying; the paragraphs may not be arranged purposefully, but each one supports and develops a thesis, more or less ▪ topic sentences are used to forecast the main point of the paragraph, but may not clearly contribute to an understanding of the overall argument; transitions establish relationships between paragraphs and sentences ▪ few errors in MLA formatting conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the title cleverly indicates subject of the paper, and the introduction effectively introduces the topic and catches reader's attention; the conclusion provides a satisfying sense of closure with a clear "so what" for the reader ▪ has a single focus, and each paragraph supports and develops a thesis; paragraphs are arranged purposefully and effectively ▪ topic sentences and transitions are clear and flow smoothly from sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph, or idea to idea, effectively linking and shaping the audience's understanding of the argument ▪ Meets highest standards of MLA formatting conventions
[-----]			

STYLE

<i>OOPS!</i>	<i>developing toward expectations</i>	<i>meeting expectations</i>	<i>exceeding expectations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has enough errors to mar the writer's <i>ethos</i> regardless of the strength of the argument; there are multiple glaring errors per page; subjects are hidden, and verbs are turned into nouns; wordy phrases and clauses take over like kudzu: It's time to break open the handbook and make a plan to improve! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> readable, but the obvious errors in grammar, punctuation, mechanics, or design begin to create <i>static</i> in the reading experience so that the <i>ethos</i> of the writer is compromised; some clear error patterns emerge; moving forward, the writer should proofread a little more carefully and/or show the writing to a trusted reviewer. clear enough, but sometimes a syntactic strangeness creeps in—subjects hide and verbs become nouns; the writer sometimes loses track of how phrases and clauses should go together, but generally the writer's intentions are clear enough; there's little variation here, and the writer taxes the reader with more words than are necessary. not necessarily compelling: This paper reads like an <i>adequate</i> academic paper that gets a job done without connecting to the reader; there's an opportunity here to move to the next level by working on specific stylistic strategies with the instructor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mostly correct: for the most part, easy to read and free from errors, though a few crop up here and there, but they don't really impede the reading experience too much; the writer needs to proofread a little more carefully to take the paper to the next level. clear: sentences are generally active, with clear enough subjects and verbs; sometimes it takes too long for a sentence to get to its verb; word choice is pragmatic, with the occasional misplaced word or phrase; sentences could be more concise, but the writer avoids distracting wordiness. somewhat compelling: there's some attempt at the sentence level to make this paper stand out stylistically; the sentences get the job done, with the occasional rhetorical move to engage the writer; phrases and clauses come together without the kind of variation and skill you see in the exceptional paper; the voice here is the voice of someone writing a <i>good</i> academic paper without necessarily connecting with the reader. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> correct: easy to read and free from errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, mechanics, and MLA formatting; clear: sentence actors (subjects) and actions (verbs) are clear and close together—the sentences are <i>active</i>, unless the writer makes a better rhetorical choice; words have rhetorically-appropriate connotations; sentences are concise; compelling: reading this paper is a pleasure because the writer is writing for <i>readers</i>—the sentence lengths vary by bringing together phrases and clauses in a variety of ways to create <i>ethos</i>; there may be (rhetorically-appropriate) allusions, irony, tropes, or schemes that show the writer is trying to create an engaging reading experience.
[-----]			

Instructor Comments:

Score: _____ Grade: _____