

| PROJECT 1 Rating Scale ⇨ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|--|----------|---|----------|--|----------|
| HOLISTIC | F At-Risk/Poor D | | C Average B | | A- Outstanding A | |
| The general experience of the composition. | Hard to read and understand. | | Doesn't fully state and support a clear claim. | | A strong, clear, supported opinion that's easy to read and understand. | |
| FORMING, FRAMING, PRESENTING THOUGHTS AND IDEAS | Score based upon how many of these MAJOR PROBLEMS are evident, and how seriously. | | Score based upon how many of these MINOR PROBLEMS are evident, and how seriously. | | Score based upon how WELL these STANDARDS are achieved. [Likely to be indicated by these features] | |
| Purpose: (“Provide your informed opinion”) Answer both parts of the question; state and support a thesis (informed opinion). | Highly unbalanced (or separate) responses to the two parts of the question. Fails to address one of the two parts. Lacking opinion. Claim very unclear or difficult to locate, and/or thesis fails to synthesize two parts of question. | | Touches upon but doesn't fully address both parts of the question. Stance/opinion not made fully clear, or difficult to locate. Stance clear but not fully developed. Thesis doesn't clearly or fully predict the support. | | Clear and well-developed stance. [Thesis statement in a predictable location, clearly stated, touching on both subtopics] [Two parts of the answer easy to distinguish] | |
| Elaboration: (“explain how you reached that conclusion”) Explain the reasoning behind the conclusion (make clear connections): Body paragraphs support topic sentences with details from sources and personal experience. | Little or no supporting details from sources; Seemingly-random selection of details from sources. Lacking topic sentences that predict paragraphs; Lacking a sense of how details connect to opinion(s). | | Seeks to explain connections but results not always fully clear. Lacking reasons or support in a few places; reader left wondering “how” or “why” in places. Not all paragraphs introduced by clear predictive topic sentences. | | Reason/support connections clear and convincing. [Topic sentences easy to locate, clearly written, predict support] [Points and particulars both present in most or all paragraphs] | |
| CRAFTING, EDITING, PROOFING WRITTEN PROSE | | | | | | |
| Shape, Power, and Emphasis: Use position in sentences and paragraphs to help readers understand what's important. Signal relationships and transitions. Get to main verbs quickly. Place old before new information. | Sentences overly simple or needlessly complicated. Sentences poorly constructed/edited (long introductions, interrupted subject-verb connections, etc.). Organizational logic not clear or signaled. | | Sentences generally easy to understand, but not always high impact. Sentences occasionally hard to understand. Organization only partially signaled. | | Sentences achieve their effects with little effort from the reader. [Parallelism, active voice, simple tense] [Coordination, subordination] [Transitions—easy to follow organization] | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Frequent Editing Errors | | <input type="checkbox"/> Occasional Editing Errors | | <input type="checkbox"/> Few Editing Errors | |
| Economy and Clarity: Use fewer words in more-effective sentences. Cut repeated words and obvious implications; prefer the affirmative. Choose well-suited and precise words. | Too many wasted words and empty phrases; wordy or mechanical. Abstract, general words chosen for important passages. Inappropriate or wrong words chosen. Confusing arrangements of subjects/topics. | | Some words and phrases could have worked harder; some waste. Mixture of abstract/concrete, specific/general word choices. Inconsistent order of subjects/topics. | | Virtually every word and phrase counts. Easy to follow and tangibly imagine. [Concrete, specific nouns; strong, active verbs; consistent order of subjects/topics] | |