|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ENGL 150 Assignment #4:**  **Understanding Place or Artifact—Campus Landscape, Building, or Art work** | **Excellent**  (Writer responds thoughtfully and creatively, requiring little or no revision) | **Good**  (Writer responds fully, requiring some revision) | **Fair**  (Writer responds mostly competently, requiring focused, substantive revision) | **Needs Work**  (Writer responds incompletely, requiring extensive revision) |
| **Context** | Clear and engaging articulation of context and purpose; the reader is well oriented from the outset: | Adequate articulation of context; the introduction is mostly engaging and the reader is mostly well oriented from the outset: | Paper’s introduction is not engaging, and orientation for the audience is inadequate: | Paper does not meet audience needs by not providing engagement and orientation at the outset: |
| **Introduction** | Introduction engages the audience with anecdotes, quotations, or vivid imagery related to artifact or building. Thesis is succinct and clear. Opening paragraphs skillfully and specifically forecast main points of essay. Approach to topic shows evidence of original thinking and attention to interesting details. | Introduction uses adequate details to develop reader interest. Thesis gives reader a general idea about the paper. Opening paragraphs mention main ideas that paper will cover. Approach to topic is conventional. | Introduction may use some stock or cliché phrasing rather than interesting details. Thesis difficult to identify. Opening paragraphs are vague concerning the main topics of the paper. Strategy for approaching the topic is more writer oriented and not readily apparent to the reader. | The paper moves straight to content without providing context for the reader. There is no thesis present on the first page, nor are any of the main topics obviously referred to. |
| **Purpose** | Approach to topic shows evidence of original thinking. Writer uses opening paragraphs to develop relevant historical and cultural background, engaging audience interest. Purpose for writing is clear and provides an answer to the reader’s “So what?” question. | Writer mentions historical and cultural background in opening page. Purpose for writing is stated but lacks strategy for developing interest, leaving reader searching for reason to read on. | The lack of context creates some difficulty in grasping the relevance of the paper. By end of first page, reader may be somewhat unclear about writer’s purpose and therefore is less motivated to continue reading. (Paper may begin to read, in part, like an accumulation of facts with no clearly stated purpose for their having been amassed.) The “So what?” question is answered in a minimal or incomplete way. | Cultural or historical context related to the artifact or building. is not presented; reader cannot discern purpose of the paper beyond an accumulation of facts. The “So what?” question is not answered for reader. |
| **Substance** | Content is well selected and developed; focus is clear and audience’s needs are accounted for: | Content is mostly well selected and developed to meet most of the audience’s needs in terms of focus and interest: | Some content is superfluous or not clearly connected to focus. Audience’s needs are not consistently accounted for: | Focus of essay is unclear. Content is not specific enough to engage reader: |
| **Details** | Paragraphs fully reflect the ideas mentioned in thesis. Each paragraph focuses on and develops a single topic or idea in an interesting and vivid way. The writer’s paragraph topic sentences are supported by detailed, factual, and descriptive sentences that go beyond a mere factual description of the campus landscape, building, or art to a discussion of its cultural or historical relevance to ISU. | The paragraphs focus on individual topics, but some paragraphs lack identifiable topic sentences or lack interesting details. Writer presents factual description of campus landscape, building, or art, but fewer details about its cultural or historical relevance to ISU. | Some paragraphs lack an identifiable single topic and details may not all fit well in the paragraph in which they appear. Description of campus landscape, building, or art is more of a formulaic or haphazard collection of facts with little of its cultural or historical relevance for ISU. | Main ideas and their supporting details are not differentiated with conventional paragraphing. Description of the campus landscape, building, or art, as well as its cultural or historical relevance to ISU are significantly lacking. |
| **Relevance** | Writer skillfully paints a historical picture of the campus landscape’s, building’s, or art’s impact on and relevance to ISU; the ISU-connection is fully fleshed out. Writer uses secondary sources to discuss the campus landscape, building, or art, and blends them with personal insights from writer’s experience with the landscape, building, or art to support main thesis; writer’s interest in the topic is clearly conveyed (the reason this topic was chosen over another is obvious). | Description and discussion of campus landscape, building, or art and its meaning for ISU is mostly adequate. While sources are used, they are cited sparingly and not always well integrated with personal insights from writer’s experience with the landscape, building, or art. The writer’s interest in the topic is present, but the reason for this topic choice is not strongly apparent. | Writer relies almost entirely on own experience to discuss campus landscape, building, or art.  No mention of the artist’s /designer’s/architect’s name in paper. Cultural or historical relevance for ISU is scant. (Conversely, there may be a heavy reliance on secondary sources with little of the writer’s own insights.)  Writer’s interest in topic seems forced. | Writer’s description of the campus landscape, building, or art is inadequate, as is use of research or discussion of personal experience with the topic. Writer does not mention site visit. Writer lacks interest in the topic; why this campus landscape, building, or art was chosen as topic is not apparent. |
| **Organization** | Organization is appropriate to topic and emphasis, with some originality; shows attention to audience needs: | Organization is conventional, showing some attention to audience needs: | Organization of paper is more writer-oriented, creating diffuse emphasis and some difficulty as reader tries to follow claims: | Organizational strategies are not useful for topic or audience and impede audience movement through paper: |
| **Body and Conclusion** | Paper is organized logically and perhaps innovatively around a specific and insightful thesis about a campus landscape, building, or art and its cultural or historical relevance for ISU. The paper is arranged for effective emphasis and audience engagement; transitions function well to tie one idea to the next. Conclusion sums up main points and leaves the reader with something to think about. | Most of paper relates to central thesis about a campus landscape, building, or art. The paper shows some deliberate arrangement for emphasis and audience needs; most ideas are tied to the next one. Cultural or historical relevance for ISU may not be entirely smoothly integrated. Transitions used often to move from one paragraph to the next. Conclusion sums up main points. | Arrangement of information about campus landscape, building, or art is more writer-based than reader-based and is sometimes difficult to follow. Main assertion (point, thesis) of paper is not entirely clear because of diffuse emphasis. Cultural or historical relevance of landscape, building, or art for ISU is not well integrated. Some transitions are weak, and the conclusion may be general or clichéd. | Arrangement of information shows little accounting for audience’s needs. Main assertion (point, thesis) of paper is not clear, nor is the campus landscape’s, building’s, or art’s cultural or historical relevance for ISU. Transitions between paragraphs are not clear or are missing entirely. Conclusion is an afterthought rather than a functional section of the paper. |
| **Individual**  **Paragraphs** | Each paragraph contributes to describing a campus landscape, building, or art and its cultural or historical relevance for ISU, with clear topics and deliberately arranged supporting details. All paragraphs support implied thesis and are tightly structured around controlling ideas. | Most paragraphs contribute to describing a campus landscape, building, or art and its cultural or historical relevance for ISU. Most paragraphs support implied thesis and are mostly structured around controlling ideas. | Some paragraphs do not obviously contribute to describing a campus artifact or building and its relation to the ISU mission. Some paragraphs show little connection to thesis and are only loosely structured around a controlling idea. | Paragraphing is not used effectively to separate and develop related ideas. Relationships among ideas are not made clear to the audience. |
| **Style** | Style is particularly well suited for topic and audience: | Style is conventional: | Style interferes with clarity in some places: | Style significantly detracts from clarity: |
| **Sentence Level** | Writing is clear, fluid, and mature. Precise, vivid and appropriate word choice. Sentences varied. Subordination and coordination used effectively. | Writing is understandable and competent with mostly precise and vivid word choice. Most sentence structures are varied, and subordination and coordination mostly used well. | Writing is vague and disjointed. Some sentences are structurally varied with some vivid word choice. | Writing is confusing with conventional word choice. Sentences are structured similarly and/or are simple sentences. |
| **Correctness**  **Conventions** | Assignment is free from sentence-level and word-level errors. | Assignment has a few sentence-level and/or word-level errors. | Assignment has several sentence-level and/or word-level errors. | Sentence-level and/or word-level errors impede reader’s understanding. |
| **Delivery** | Innovative accommodation of media and conventions; audience expectations and processing are carefully accounted for: | Adequate accommodation of media and conventions; audience expectations and processing are mostly accounted for: | Some problems with audience first impressions; inadequate proofreading interferes in places with audience processing: | Delivery choices distract from paper and interfere with audience expectations and processing: |
| **Document**  **Formatting** | Paper is formatted correctly following MLA style. Visual is placed appropriately and correctly into text, with attention to size, spacing, and margins. | Paper is double-spaced and mostly follows most MLA style. Visual placement is mostly correct. No extra spaces between paragraphs. Page numbers may be missing. | Paper is double spaced but does not otherwise consistently follow MLA formatting conventions. Visual placement lacks attention to size, spacing, and/or margins. Page numbers are missing, and extra spaces may occur between paragraphs. | Paper does not follow any recognizable MLA formatting conventions. Visual and page numbers are missing, and extra spaces occur between paragraphs. |
| **Proper**  **Style Conventions** | In-text citations follow correct MLA or style, and Works Cited page is formatted correctly. Visual includes title and/or captions. | Some minor problems with MLA in-text citation, and Works Cited is mostly formatted correctly with one or two minor errors. Visual may be missing a title and/or a caption. | Evidence of attempt to cite sources, but in-text citations and/or Works Cited page are not correct. Visual missing title and/or caption. | Few to no in-text citations used. No Works Cited or bibliography. No visual included in essay. |