**ENG 150 Argumentative Synthesis Part Two Rubric**

**Note:** This rubric isn’t all-inclusive, meaning there are elements of good writing that may not be fully or accurately represented in the categories and descriptions below but that can still influence the overall assessment of the essay.

Strong Proficient Developing Weak

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Purpose** | The paper has a well-developed thesis with an insightful set of criteria. The significance of the issue and analysis is clearly established. A relatively objective ~~neutral~~ and academic tone is established and maintained throughout the essay. | The paper has a workable (though perhaps shallow) thesis that leads the reader into the paper and serves as a guide to its contents; the significance of the synthesis is not thoroughly communicated. The tone at times might fall below academic standards with informal language or with the writer expressing his or her opinion on the issue itself rather than on the debate around the issue | The paper has some components of a thesis (subject, positions, hint at organization) but may be underdeveloped or missing a clearly articulated motive for writing. The essay begins to use language that is academic. There are areas of concern related to tone and language. | The paper lacks a clear purpose or thesis or the thesis does not accurately convey what the paper develops.  The essay’s casual and informal language is not appropriate for an academic audience. Tone is at times inappropriate. |
| **Content** | The paper demonstrates excellent development of each point of view and focuses on relevant details. Clearly explained examples support the analysis and the issue is thoroughly researched. | The paper contains adequate support for the claims, but would benefit from more research, more thorough interpretation of source material, or from more specific development of relevant points. | The paper has some development but lacks sufficient support or contains irrelevant details that do not develop a clear sense of purpose. | The paper needs more details on every level (main ideas, related ideas, specific ideas). |
| **Analysis / Synthesis** | The author is well capable of both describing and analyzing various positions and is able to move beyond simplistic summary into intelligent interpretation and synthesis. | Analysis and synthesis are solid, but the paper could benefit from more thorough summary, analysis, and synthesis of the various positions surrounding the issue of focus. Occasionally, the relationship between positions and the context isn’t clear. | The author describes various positions, but fails to fully analyze or interpret their relationship to one another. | The paper does not appear to do much more than string together summaries of several positions on the issue. Little to no analysis or synthesis. |
| **Organization** | The paper contains strong topic sentences and builds upon the purpose indicated in the thesis. Clear transitions connect ideas both on the paragraph level and the sentence level. | The overall structure of the paper is clear, but some topic sentences are weak. Transitions that would clarify the relationships among main ideas are occasionally missing or unclear. | The paper has one main idea per paragraph, but some topic sentences fail to adequately present the paragraph's argument. Transitions are either missing or misleading. | Paragraphs are not organized around a central idea, and the overall structure and purpose of the paper is difficult to follow. |
| **Mechanics** | The paper demonstrates mastery over the basics in sentence completeness, structure, variety, word choice, grammar, and punctuation. It maintains a clear and efficient style. MLA is not an issue. | The paper displays good control over mechanics; some areas may still need sentence level revision. Occasional minor problems with wordiness, punctuation, pronouns and modifiers. MLA is not an issue. | The paper shows mechanics are an area of concern. There may be recurring sentence fragments, comma splices, word usage errors, redundant clauses, etc. Excessive wordiness, grammar, or punctuation errors maybe a concern. May be MLA issues. | The paper lacks basic control over mechanics and contains excessive proof-reading errors or habitual problems with punctuation and grammar. May be serious MLA issues or no MLA guidelines followed. |
| **Research** | The paper uses at least three additional sources. All of the sources are high-quality. The sources are introduced smoothly using the author’s credentials. The sources effectively add to the essay. | The paper has at least three additional sources. There is an attempt to some high-quality sources. | The paper has a couple of new sources. Some sources could be replaced by more credible or higher-quality sources. There may be evidence of using library databases. | The paper lacks any new sources or sources are not very credible. No attempt at using library databases to find research. Research might not be relevant to the point the author is making (too much or too little quoted, or inaccurately applied). |

Comments: