

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 (<i>logos</i>) ▪ 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 (<i>kairos</i>) ▪ Identifies and addresses the appropriate audience, but perhaps does not fully meet audience's needs for sound evidence ▪ 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; sometimes it isn't clear why a source should be convincing (<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 that requires research evidence to resolve (<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, demonstrating the credibility of compelling sources to make arguments (<i>logos</i>) ▪ Effectively evokes the appropriate emotion in the audience (<i>pathos</i>) ▪ Effectively responds to counter arguments (<i>procatalepsis</i>)
1-----			-----10

RESEARCH

<i>OOPS!</i>	<i>developing toward expectations</i>	<i>meeting expectations</i>	<i>exceeding expectations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The argument is under-researched and/or reliant on a single source or two; there is no conversation going on here ▪ Sources are incorporated in ineffective and inappropriate ways, or the paper is mere report or summary of the writer's research; sources are old, without credibility, irrelevant, or biased ▪ Writer may inadvertently plagiarize by documenting sources incorrectly or not at all ▪ Paper is riddled with errors in MLA formatting and documenting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research is inadequate or presented ineffectively, and the space the writer has created in the conversation may not be clear; the writer has done research—that's clear—but may rely heavily on one or two sources ▪ Although the writer cites sources, he/she may drop them in without authority, attribution, or explanation; it isn't clear that sources are current, credible, relevant, or bias-free, and in fact some of the sources are the opposite ▪ while the writer still cites sources in the paper, the writer has difficulty blending quotes into the language of the paper; long, irrelevant quotations are used, and some sources cited seem irrelevant to the project; sometimes the language of a source is written without quotation marks ▪ errors in MLA formatting and documentation appear with some frequency; there may be some discrepancies between in-text citations and the works cited page 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the various perspectives in the conversation may not be clear, but it is obvious the student has done good research on the topic; it may seem that the writer hasn't quite figured out where he/she fits in relation to other voices ▪ Incorporates sources into the paper somewhat effectively, though sometimes it is not completely clear that the sources are current, credible, relevant, or bias-free ▪ the writer may rely too heavily on quotes, but he/she seems to understand the sources and how to use them; sometimes quotes may not be introduced or explained, but there is a conversation happening in the paper ▪ A few errors in MLA formatting and documenting appear randomly throughout the paper, but such errors do not distract from the reader's understanding of the argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates that he/she has thoroughly researched the issue, incorporating a variety of credible sources while maintaining an independent argument; the writer creates a space for him/herself to enter the academic conversation on this topic ▪ Incorporates sources effectively, providing compelling support that is obviously current, credible, relevant, and free from bias ▪ paraphrases, summarizes, and quotes effectively to support the argument; it is clear that the writer understands these sources and how to incorporate them; each quote is introduced and contextualized in the writing; quotations are spare, necessary, and compelling ▪ Adheres closely to MLA citation and formatting standards both within the text and on the works cited page
1-----			-----10

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 argument 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 the organization is lopsided—may spend too much time on one subtopic paragraphs start one place, end another 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, with a single focus 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; sentences flow together, though not completely effectively; paragraphs are focused, but not tightly so 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
1-----	-----10		

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; not much care has been given to formatting or design; some clear error patterns emerge; moving forward, the writer should proofread more carefully and/or show the writing to a trusted reviewer and/or consult a writing handbook 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 impede the reading experience too much; MLA formatting issues arise here and there, with a general sense that the writer needs to proofread a little more carefully or consult a handbook 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 for quoting, paraphrasing, summarizing, and citing 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
1-----	-----10		

INSTRUCTOR COMMENTS:

GRADE:

SCORE: