

TOTAL: /120

Criteria	10-9	8	7	6	5-0
Ideas and Content	1. The focus is stated clearly in the thesis and meets requirements 2. Clear, relevant, interesting/vivid, and accurate details develop and enrich the central focus. 3. Topic is sufficiently narrow and manageable 4. Topic is particularly suited to argumentation 5. Ideas engage, intrigue, or inspire the reader	1. The focus is stated clearly in the thesis and meets requirements. 2. Clear, relevant, and accurate details develop the central focus 3. Topic is sufficiently narrow and manageable 4. Topic is suitable for argumentation 5. Ideas interest the reader	1. The reader gets only a vague sense of the focus from the thesis 2. Appropriate and accurate details partially develop the central focus 3. Topic is fairly broad but manageable 4. Topic is not completely suited to argumentation, but writer attempts to take a position	1. Although there is a thesis, the focus is unclear. 2. Although details are present, they are loosely related, obvious, or dull 3. Details provide weak support for focus 4. Topic maybe too broad to argue convincingly or not suitable to argumentation at all	1. The focus is unclear; may lack an identifiable thesis 2. Specific requirements have been ignored or misunderstood. 3. Details are missing, incorrect, or unclear 4. Details repeat each other and/or seem random and not related to focus 5. Topic is too broad and/or unsuitable for argumentation
Organization	1. Each developmental paragraph addresses a specific aspect of the topic. 2. The sequence is effective and moves the reader through the paper—the order may or may not be conventional. 3. Thoughtful and sophisticated transitions show how all ideas are connected 4. The writing is clearly organized in a way that enhances meaning or helps to develop the central idea.	1. Each developmental paragraph addresses a specific aspect of the topic 2. The sequence is effective, although it may be slightly formulaic 3. Adequate transitions make the paper read smoothly 4. The writing is organized in a way that guides the reader efficiently and matches purpose	1. Each developmental paragraph addresses a specific aspect of the topic. 2. Sequence is logical, but overly formulaic organization may inhibit ideas 3. Most transitions work; some connections are missing/vague. 4. The reader does not struggle to understand/make her own connections to focus	1. Each developmental paragraph attempts to address a specific aspect of the topic. 2. Some parts of the sequence are logical, but others seem random, lack purpose 3. Transitions are limited. 4. The reader sometimes struggles to understand/make own connections to focus	1. Developmental paragraphs are unfocused and may be confusing. 2. Sequence seems random, lacks purpose 3. Transitions are either not used or used ineffectively 4. The reader often struggles to understand/make own connections to focus
Diction	1. Lively, powerful verbs provide energy. (Be verbs are limited). 2. Specific nouns add color and clarity. 3. Modifiers effectively provide strong imagery. 4. Expression is fresh and appealing: original or unusual phrasing adds to meaning. Figurative language is effective. 5. Vocabulary is not only mature and precise but sometimes striking 6. Vocabulary is not overdone or inflated. 7. Diction is concise, avoiding nominalizations, redundancy, etc.	1. Some powerful verbs, specific nouns, and descriptive modifiers enhance meaning. 2. Expression attempts to be fresh and appealing. Some original or unusual phrasing adds to the meaning. Figurative language, if used, is generally effective. 3. Vocabulary is mature, but, at times, overdone and/or imprecise. 4. Diction is usually concise, but shows some evidence of nominalizations, redundancy, etc.	1. Words are reasonably accurate and convey the intended message in a general manner. 2. Some verbs provide energy, and some simply link one point to another. 3. Some nouns are specific; other nouns are fairly general. 4. Expression is limited. Figurative language, if used, may be cliché or otherwise non-effective. Vocabulary is age-appropriate, but tends to be pedestrian, or attempts to be uncommon and leads to confusion.	1. Words are usually age-appropriate 2. Word choice often inhibits understanding due to diction that is inaccurate, too vague, or, in an attempt to be striking, becomes distracting, or confusing 3. Expression is limited. Figurative language is not used or is consistently cliché. 4. Diction may often be excessively wordy	1. Word choice severely limits the clarity of the intended message. 2. Verbs, nouns, and/or modifiers lack the ability to convey an image. 3. No figurative language is used

Syntax	1. Sentences are effectively varied in length and structure; sentences effectively use structures such as loose, periodic, cumulative, etc.; non-conventional structures (i.e. fragments) are used effectively	1. Sentences are effectively varied in length and structure	1. Sentences are generally constructed correctly, but are routine, functional only	1. Sentences are sometimes incorrectly constructed (run-ons, fragments, not grammatically parallel, etc.) leading to confusion	1. Sentences are often incorrectly constructed leading to confusion
	2. Sentences use purposeful, varied beginnings	2. Sentences use varied beginnings	2. Sentences are not all alike; there is some variety in length, structure, and beginnings although not enough to demonstrate author's craft	2. Sentences are not all alike; there is some variety in length, structure, and beginnings, although not enough to demonstrate author's craft	2. Sentence length, structure, and beginnings are virtually identical OR apparently completely random
	3. Syntax helps convey meaning through purposeful and effective use of rhetorical devices such as rhetorical questions, anaphora, chiasmus, antithesis, etc.	3. Sentences sometimes effectively use rhetorical devices such as rhetorical questions, anaphora, chiasmus, antithesis, etc.	3. Writer attempts to use a few rhetorical devices, but these do not achieve their purpose; parallelism (of all kinds) is used in order for sentences to be grammatically correct, but not for effect	3. No apparent attempt to use rhetorical devices is evident	3. No apparent attempt to use rhetorical devices is evident
Voice	4. Writing has cadence	4. Some parts of the writing have cadence; one or two spots are choppy or tortuous	4. While the writing does not really have cadence, it would be easy enough to read aloud; two or three spots are choppy or tortuous	4. Sentences are too often choppy or tortuous; reading the text aloud would present difficulties	4. Sentences are excessively choppy or tortuous; it would be extremely difficult to read the text aloud
	1. The personality of the writer is evident in the writing; writer is confident	1. A commitment to the topic is obvious.	1. Commitment to the topic seems to vary throughout	1. Commitment to the topic is limited.	1. The writing lacks commitment to the topic.
	2. The writer's enthusiasm and/or interest brings the topic to life.	2. The writer connects to the audience and clearly indicates a purpose for the writing.	2. The writer attempts to connect to the audience; purpose is clear	2. Connection to the audience and purpose for the writing are unclear.	2. Connection to the audience and purpose for the writing are unclear.
Conventions	3. The tone is appropriate and consistently controlled.	3. The tone is sincere, pleasant and generally appropriate.	3. The tone is generally appropriate.	3. The tone is generally flat	3. The tone is flat or inappropriate.
	4. The overall effect is individualistic, expressive, and engaging.	4. The overall effect is competent and pleasant	4. The overall effect is businesslike or neutral.	4. The overall effect is "I'm doing this only for the grade"	4. The overall effect is disengaged, bored, or even insincere
	1. A strong grasp of standard writing conventions is apparent: capitalization is accurate; punctuation is smooth and enhances meaning; spelling is correct even on more difficult words; grammar is essentially correct; usage is correct; paragraphing (indenting) enhances the organization of the paper.	1. A good grasp of standard writing conventions is apparent: capitalization is correct; punctuation is smooth and enhances meaning; spelling of common words is accurate, and more difficult words are generally correct; grammar is essentially correct; usage is generally correct; paragraphing (indenting) works with the organization of the paper.	1. Meets the criteria for an 8, but errors are more numerous	1. A basic grasp of standard writing conventions is apparent. Errors in conventions may impair readability.	1. A minimal grasp of standard writing conventions is apparent. Numerous errors in conventions distract and/or confuse the reader.
	2. Specialized conventions (title, subtitles, in-text notes, table of contents, works cited) are used accurately enhance the text.	2. Specialized conventions (title, subtitles, in-text notes, table of contents, works cited) generally enhance the text		2. Specialized conventions (title, subtitles, in-text notes, table of contents, works cited) are disruptive or confusing.	2. Specialized conventions (title, subtitles, in-text notes, table of contents, works cited) are disruptive or confusing.

Criteria	10-9	8	7	6	5-0
Introduction & Conclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction, including title, is powerful and insightful and presents the thesis in a compelling way. 2. The conclusion is fully developed and leads to a powerful abstraction (insight), bringing closure to the piece 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction, including title, is interesting, meaningful and presents the thesis/main purpose clearly. 2. The conclusion brings the essay to a close in a memorable way, but does not necessarily provide insight 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction, including title, is adequate and presents thesis in a general way. 2. Conclusion simply repeats the ideas in the introduction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction, including title, is inadequate for one of more of the following reasons: lacks attempt at attention-getter; no logical progression of ideas; too long or too short; thesis unclear 2. Conclusion simply repeats the ideas in the introduction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is empty of Meaning 2. Thesis may not be evident 3. The conclusion is empty of meaning.
Support (Logical Appeal)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is detailed, specific, correct and embedded. 2. Level of support is consistent throughout. 3. Claim-Data-Explanation/Warrant (CDE) is clear in every developmental paragraphs 4. Writer balances quotations, summaries, and paraphrases from research 5. Logical fallacies are avoided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is usually detailed, specific, correct and embedded. 2. Most claims are well supported; one or two may need more. 3. Claim-Data-Explanation/Warrant (CDE) is clear in most developmental paragraphs 4. Writer balances quotations, summaries, and paraphrases from research 5. Logical fallacies are avoided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support is sometimes detailed, sometimes specific, sometimes awkwardly embedded 2. Several claims may need more or better support 3. Some claims may lack adequate explanation/warrant 4. Writer may rely too heavily on one type of support—most notably quotations—demonstrating less success in synthesizing sources 5. Writer may commit one or two minor logical fallacies—most notably begging the question due to lack of adequate explanation/warrant 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support lacks detail and specificity; support is often awkwardly embedded ("dropped" quotes) 2. Some quoted passages are too long and then not developed. (CDE weak). 3. Writer may rely so much on quotation he/she comes dangerously close to plagiarism, OR writer may rely so much on paraphrase/summary that the paper does not seem to be research based 4. Writer may commit a several small or one or two minor logical fallacies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is little or no support. 2. The writer rambles and doesn't follow CDE 3. Writer may rely so much on quotation he/she comes dangerously close to plagiarism, OR writer may rely so much on paraphrase/summary that the paper does not seem to be research based 4. A logical fallacy may be imbedded in the thesis of the paper
Persuasiveness (Emotional and Ethical Appeal)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writer establishes a strong ethical appeal through demonstration of thorough research—including choosing and clearly introducing reliable source—and fair treatment of differing points of view 2. Writer establishes strong emotional appeal through purposeful manipulation of language (rhetorical devices) 3. Essay reveals sophisticated understanding of the issue, acknowledging complexities, ambiguities, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writer establishes ethical appeal through demonstration of thorough research—including choosing and clearly introducing reliable source—and fair treatment of differing points of view 2. Writer establishes emotional appeal through manipulation of language (rhetorical devices) 3. Essay reveals thorough understanding of the issue 4. Writer takes a clear stand on the issue with only one 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writer establishes some ethical appeal through demonstration of adequate research—including usually choosing reliable source—and recognition of differing points of view 2. Writer attempts to establish emotional appeal through use of language (rhetorical devices),but is inconsistent or not always effective 3. Essay reveals adequate understanding of the topic 4. Writer takes an initial stand on the issue, but 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writer establishes limited ethical appeal; more research, more reliable sources, or more attention to differing points of view are needed 2. Writer establishes limited or no emotional appeal because of lack of attention to language (rhetorical devices) 3. Essay reveals limited understanding of the issue 4. Writer's stand on the issue is unclear or inconsistent 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Essay lacks ethical appeal due to significant problems with research or oversight of differing points of view 2. No apparent attempt was made to engage the reader's emotions 3. Essay reveals misunderstanding(s) of the issues 4. Writer takes no stand on the issue

Documentation	4. and/or contradictions Writer takes a clear, consistent stand on the issue	or two inconsistencies	may lose focus in the body of the essay		
	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.
MLA Format	1. ALL internal documentation is correct	1. Internal documentation has some minor errors in placement, punctuation, or capitalization		1. Internal documentation has significant errors (i.e. documentation is present but does not clearly indicate the source)	1. One or more source in internal documentation is not listed on the Works Cited 2. One or more passage is not correctly documented (NOTE: One error in either of these will equal a zero in this category and will have severe negative effect on several other categories; MORE THAN ONE ERROR IN EITHER CATEGORY WILL RESULT IN A ZERO ON THE PAPER!)
	1. NO ERRORS in MLA format, including the Works Cited (NOTE: For the blog, the actual TEXT does not have to be in MLA format. Follow MLA format for your Works Cited list and for including and identifying visuals.) 2. TURN IN A HARD COPY OF YOUR WORKS CITED ON DUE DATE!	1. A few minor errors in MLA format (i.e. punctuation errors)			1. Many or significant errors in MLA format (NOTE: Many or significant errors on your Works Cited may result in a zero on the paper!)
Technology	1. Blog is set up with a page for each of the following: Introduction (may be the "home" page), Narration, Confirmation, Concession & Refutation, and Conclusion. 2. The appearance of the blog is appealing and appropriate for the topic; it is easy to find things and navigate the site. 3. ALL Web sources are linked (on the first use of the source only). 4. At least two visual sources	1. Blog is set up with a page for each of the following: Introduction (may be the "home" page), Narration, Confirmation, Concession & Refutation, and Conclusion. 2. The appearance of the blog is appropriate for the topic; it is easy to find things and navigate the site. 3. ALL Web sources are linked (on the first use of the source only). 4. At least one visual sources	1. Blog is set up with a page for each of the following: Introduction (may be the "home" page), Narration, Confirmation, Concession & Refutation, and Conclusion. 2. The appearance of the blog may or may not be appropriate for the topic; the reader can find things and navigate the site with some effort. 3. ALL Web sources are linked (on the first use of the source only).	1. Blog is set up with a page for each of the following: Introduction (may be the "home" page), Narration, Confirmation, Concession & Refutation, and Conclusion. 2. The appearance of the blog may not be appropriate for the topic and/or it may be difficult to find things or navigate the site. 3. MOST Web sources are linked (on the first use of the source only).	1. Blog is missing a page for one or more of the following: Introduction (may be "home" page), Narration, Confirmation, Concession & Refutation, and Conclusion. 2. The appearance of the blog is distracting and makes navigating the site difficult. 3. SOME Web sources are linked (on the first use of the source only). 4. Visual sources do not appear on the site; visual



appear on the site (imbedded,
not linked)

appear on the site (imbedded,
not linked)

4. At least one visual sources
appear on the site (imbedded,
not linked)

4. Visual sources are linked to
on the site, but none are
imbedded and appear on the
site.

sources are mentioned in the
text, but not linked.
