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Comments (use back if needed):
## Descriptors for Rubric: Condensed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre/Audience</strong></td>
<td>Uses conventions in skillful way</td>
<td>Uses conventions in somewhat skillful way</td>
<td>Uses conventions in formulaic way</td>
<td>Does not follow conventions consistently</td>
<td>Fails to follow most or any conventions</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Explicit, nuanced, complex stance</td>
<td>Explicit and nuanced, but not complex, stance</td>
<td>Stance defined in general terms</td>
<td>Vague stance</td>
<td>No clear stance</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>All ideas developed with specific, relevant information.</td>
<td>Most ideas developed with specific, relevant information. Reader raises few questions</td>
<td>Ideas not developed consistently. Supported with vague generalization or inappropriate examples</td>
<td>Most ideas not developed or supported with inappropriate examples</td>
<td>Ideas stated, not developed</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Structure imparts feeling of wholeness and skill</td>
<td>Structure imparts a feeling of wholeness but not skill</td>
<td>Structure breaks down in some places, though solid overall</td>
<td>Structure feels rough or unclear</td>
<td>Structure clear or confusing</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar/mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Few or no errors exist; those present have no effect on reading</td>
<td>Errors obvious but not distracting</td>
<td>Errors begin to interfere with reading</td>
<td>Several distracting errors or multiple patterns of error</td>
<td>Numerous errors make understanding text difficult or impossible</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>Almost all revisions make draft stronger</td>
<td>Most revisions make draft stronger</td>
<td>Some revisions strengthen, but some weaken draft</td>
<td>Few revisions, with little effect on quality</td>
<td>Very few revisions; may make final worse</td>
<td>No evidence of revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptors for Rubric

This document contains an expanded explanation of the criteria making up the baseline and portfolio evaluation rubrics for College Composition (revised Summer 2011). Each criterion is briefly defined and linked to common terms used for it in composition textbooks. Characteristics of each level in a criterion are also included.

Genre/Audience: The writing demonstrates an understanding of the conventions of the genres they are writing as well as for academic writing in general. See p. 44 for the conventions of the required genres.

Terms related to this criterion: conventions, community of readers, discourse community, genre, style, tone

- Score of 5: the writer follows all or almost all of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. In addition, the writer demonstrates a skillful ability to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader’s expectations.
- Score of 4: the writer follows most, if not all, of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. There is evidence of effort made to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader’s expectations. However, those efforts are not as skillful as a level-five essay.
- Score of 3: the writer follows most of the conventions. However, they do so in a formulaic way that shows little attempt to engage the audience.
- Score of 2: the writer follows most of the conventions but does not do so consistently. They may also not follow some conventions, but the reader gets the sense the writer understands the conventions.
- Score of 1: the writer fails to follow most or any of the genre conventions and of academic writing in general.

Focus: The writing presents a unified, clear stance with respect to the characteristics of the assignment. In a given essay, each paragraph relates to that stance.

Terms related to this criterion: main idea, purpose, stance, thesis statement

- Score of 5: explicit, nuanced stance. The reader feels like the writer has constructed a complex, well thought-out point.
- Score of 4: stance is explicit and/or nuanced, but not to the degree of a five. The reader may feel like some minor points are missing or that the stance could be more complex.
- Score of 3: stance somewhat clear, but may be defined in general terms (i.e. “subject A and B are a like in some ways and different in others” or “I agree/disagree with X” without giving reasons for their stance)
- Score of 2: vague stance or purpose. It may only apply to part of the piece.
- Score of 1: no clear stance or purpose.
**Development**: The main ideas in the writing are supported with specific, relevant information.

*Terms related to this criterion*: details, evidence, examples, facts, observations, statistics, testimony

- **Score of 5**: all ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay’s focus. The reader feels like she or he has learned a lot from reading the piece.
- **Score of 4**: all major and most minor ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay’s focus. However, the reader occasionally raises questions or wishes for more information.
- **Score of 3**: ideas are not developed consistently, causing the reader to want more information about some points. Ideas, in places, are clear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Some examples may not be appropriate.
- **Score of 2**: most ideas are not developed or are supported with inappropriate examples. The support is made up almost entirely unclear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Overall, the piece seems to have been written quickly and without the writer thinking through the ideas he or she wanted to convey.
- **Score of 1**: ideas are stated without any development at all.

**Organization**: The writing uses an overall and paragraph structures appropriate to the assignment(s).

*Terms related to this criterion*: coherence, cohesion, mode, patterns of development, structure, transitions

- **Score of 5**: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall pieces that imparts a feeling of wholeness and skill.
- **Score of 4**: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall piece that is effective but that may not be artful. Some slight breakdowns exist, but they are almost unnoticeable and seem more like isolated gaffes than patterns of error.
- **Score of 3**: the structure of the essay breaks down in some places, but holds together overall. At the paragraph level, some sentences are out of place. Some transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied among the paragraphs ideas.
- **Score of 2**: the structure of the essay feels rough and unclear. At the paragraph level, multiple sentences are out of place. Most of the transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied by the paragraph’s ideas. The pieces seems to have been planned quickly and not revised.
- **Score of 1**: the writer uses an unclear or confusing overall organization. The paragraphs lack coherence; sentences are disorganized, with little or no effective use of transitions.
**Grammar/Mechanics**: the essay follows the conventions of Edited Academic English. This includes conventions for citing sources, regardless of the system used. An essay does not have to be perfect to receive a score of 5 in this criteria. Instead, consider whether the errors would either distract an average reader or make them doubt the writer’s credibility.

*Terms related to this criterion*: diction/word choice, documentation, punctuation, sentence boundaries, sentence structure, spelling

- **Score of 5**: errors do not detract from the essay’s central focus and from the smooth delivery of the writer’s ideas. Few or no errors exist, and those that appear are minor or reflect obscure rules.
- **Score of 4**: errors are obvious but not to the point of distracting an average reader.
- **Score of 3**: grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors begin to interfere with understanding the text’s meaning. Patterns of status-marking error may exist (ex. sentence boundaries, verb endings).
- **Score of 2**: several distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text’s meaning difficult. Multiple patterns of error exist.
- **Score of 1**: numerous distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text’s meaning difficult or impossible.

**Revision**: the writer made changes between drafts to the essay’s focus, organization, development, and/or style that lead to a more successful final essay. These changes can take place at any level of the text (overall, paragraph, or sentence). Invention and planning work used to create a rough draft counts as evidence of revision.

*Terms related to this criterion*: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement. (Note: The last two are not done as often, even when they are needed.)

- **Score of 5**: almost all of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used all four forms of revision as appropriate.
- **Score of 4**: Most, but not all, of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used most of the forms of revision, but may have needed to use others. (ex. the added and deleted material, but should have also rearranged it).
- **Score of 3**: the draft includes some revisions that make the final draft stronger, but others are needed. The writer mostly used addition and deletion, even if substitution and rearrangement was also needed. Some of the revisions may distract from the draft’s quality.
- **Score of 2**: The draft includes few revisions, most of which have no influence on the final draft’s quality. The writer may have used only one form of revision even though others are needed.
- **Score of 1**: the draft includes very few revisions; most either have no influence on the final draft’s quality or make it worse. It seems like the writer just retyped the original draft.
- **Score of 0**: no evidence of revision. The writer turned in only one draft and no invention/planning work.