

# Writing Assessment Rubric for EN 101

(Adapted from EN 102 Rubric and WC 201 Rubric)

GRADE	ORGANIZATION (Introduction, Thesis, Body, Conclusion)	RHETORICAL KNOWLEDGE (Analysis)	CRITICAL RESPONSE (Development with Logic and Evidence)	KNOWLEDGE OF CONVENTIONS (Style and Documentation)	WRITING AS A PROCESS (Peer Reviews, Revisions, and Research)
<b>A</b> (18-20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents <b>strong focus</b> on <i>purpose</i></li> <li>• <b>Creates clear/complete thesis</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates clear/complete introduction, body, and/or conclusion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Responds appropriately</b> using various rhetorical patterns: description, narrative, comparison/contrast, or cause and effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strongly supports thesis</b> with logic and evidence</li> <li>• <b>Strongly integrates</b> writer's ideas with appropriate <i>primary</i> and <i>secondary</i> sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Minor errors</b> in standard <i>grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</i> may be present.</li> <li>• <b>Uses appropriate diction</b> (<i>word choice/vocabulary</i>) and <i>syntax</i> (<i>word order/sentence structure</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Documented appropriately</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sources strongly reflect</b> <i>location, evaluation, organization, and use</i> of a variety of scholarly and informal electronic and Internet sources when appropriate.</li> <li>• Drafts show <b>clear evidence</b> of <i>revision, editing, and proofreading</i> with respect to <i>content, development, organization, voice, and mechanics</i>.</li> <li>• Accompanied by two or more rough <i>drafts peer reviewed</i></li> </ul>
<b>B</b> (16 - 17.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Focus may shift somewhat</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates somewhat clear/complete thesis</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates somewhat clear/complete introduction, body, and/or conclusion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Responds</b> using various rhetorical patterns: description, narrative, comparison/contrast, or cause and effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While essay supports <i>thesis</i> with logic and evidence, <b>some inconsistencies</b> may occur.</li> <li>• While writer does <b>integrate</b> ideas with appropriate <i>primary</i> and <i>secondary</i> sources, <b>some inconsistencies</b> may occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>More errors</b> in standard <i>grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</i> may be present; however, <b>errors do not interfere</b> with writer's meaning.</li> <li>• <b>Uses somewhat appropriate diction</b> (<i>word choice/vocabulary</i>) and <i>syntax</i> (<i>word order/sentence structure</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Minor documentation errors</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sources reflect</b> <i>location, evaluation, organization, and use</i> of a variety of scholarly and informal electronic and Internet sources when appropriate.</li> <li>• Drafts show <b>some evidence</b> of <i>revision, editing, and proofreading</i> with respect to <i>content, development, organization, voice, and mechanics</i>.</li> <li>• Accompanied by two or more rough <i>drafts peer reviewed</i></li> </ul>
<b>C</b> (14-15.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Vague focus</b> on <i>purpose</i></li> <li>• <b>Creates vague thesis</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates vague introduction, body, and/or conclusion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Responds somewhat</b> using various rhetorical patterns: description, narrative, comparison/contrast, or cause and effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While essay supports <i>thesis</i> with logic and evidence, <b>a pattern of inconsistencies</b> may occur.</li> <li>• While writer does <b>integrate</b> ideas with appropriate <i>primary</i> and <i>secondary</i> sources, <b>a pattern of inconsistencies</b> may occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A pattern of errors</b> in standard <i>grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</i> may be present; <b>errors interfere somewhat</b> with writer's meaning.</li> <li>• <b>Uses vague diction</b>(<i>word choice/vocabulary</i>) and <i>syntax</i>(<i>word order/sentence structure</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Pattern of documentation errors</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sources marginally reflect</b> <i>location, evaluation, organization, and use</i> of a variety of scholarly and informal electronic and Internet sources when appropriate.</li> <li>• Drafts show <b>marginal evidence</b> of <i>revision, editing, and proofreading</i>.</li> <li>• Accompanied by one or more rough <i>drafts peer reviewed</i></li> </ul>
<b>D</b> (12-13.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Unclear focus</b> on <i>purpose</i></li> <li>• <b>Creates unclear thesis</b></li> <li>• <b>Creates unclear introduction, body, and/or conclusion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Unclear response</b> using various rhetorical patterns: description, narrative, comparison/contrast, or cause and effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While there is an attempt to support <i>thesis</i> with logic and evidence, <b>frequent and disruptive inconsistencies</b> that weaken argument occur.</li> <li>• While writer does attempt to <b>integrate</b> ideas with appropriate <i>primary</i> and <i>secondary</i> sources, <b>frequent and disruptive inconsistencies</b> may occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Frequent errors</b> in standard <i>grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</i> may be present; these <b>errors interfere</b> with writer's meaning.</li> <li>• <b>Uses unclear diction</b>(<i>word choice/vocabulary</i>) and <i>syntax</i>(<i>word order/sentence structure</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Frequent documentation errors</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Little evidence that sources reflect</b> <i>location, evaluation, organization, and use</i> of a variety of scholarly and informal electronic and Internet sources when appropriate</li> <li>• Drafts show <b>little evidence</b> of <i>revision, editing, and proofreading</i>.</li> <li>• Accompanied by one or more rough <i>drafts peer reviewed</i></li> </ul>
<b>F</b> (0-11.9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No focus</b> on <i>purpose</i></li> <li>• <b>No thesis</b></li> <li>• <b>No organization</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No response</b> using various rhetorical patterns: description, narrative, comparison/contrast, or cause and effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No support of thesis</b> with logic and evidence</li> <li>• <b>No integration</b> of ideas with appropriate <i>primary</i> and <i>secondary</i> sources</li> <li>• <b>No critical analysis</b> beyond mere opinion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Frequent and serious errors</b> in standard <i>grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</i> may be present; these <b>errors severely inhibit</b> writer's meaning.</li> <li>• <b>No focus</b> on <i>diction</i> and <i>syntax</i></li> <li>• <b>Serious documentation errors</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No evidence</b> of attention to source collection</li> <li>• <b>No evidence</b> of <i>revision, editing, or proofreading</i></li> <li>• Accompanied by no rough <i>draft(s) peer reviewed</i></li> </ul>

**A = 93-100      A- = 90-92      B+ = 87-89      B = 83-86      B- = 80-82      C+ = 77-79      C = 73-76      C- = 70-72      D+ = 67-69      D = 60-66      F = 0-59**

• **Bolded terminology** represents assessment; *italicized terms* represent a) familiar terms students should know from high school and b) terms common to all sections of The Write Course (WC 201).