**Rhetorical Analysis Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Superior****5** | **Proficient****4-3** | **Weak****2** | **Needs Work****1-0** |
| **Introduction and Thesis****(X2)** | The author begins with a thorough and specific introduction, stating context and identifying the author’s argument, and giving a clear thesis statement about the effectiveness of the article.  | The author begins with an introduction, stating context and identifying the author’s argument, and giving a clear thesis statement about the effectiveness of the article.  The introduction may, at points, lack specificity. | The introduction is somewhat incomplete and lacking in specific detail, regarding context, facts about the text, and clear thesis. | The  author has not included a valid, clear introduction in their paper. |
| **Synopsis** | The author effectively and thoroughly summarizes the content of the source article. (SOAPStone) | The author summarizes the content of the source article. (SOAPStone) | The author’s summary of the source article may lack specificity. (SOAPStone) | The  author has not included clear summary of the source article in their paper. (SOAPStone) |
| **Analysis of Rhetorical Devices and Appeals****(X2)** | \* The author addresses the author’s specific use of appeal (logos, pathos, ethos) by quoting and/or paraphrasing the text effectively, using the evidence as support.\* The author thoroughly analyzes the appeal/evidence, scrutinizing effectiveness. \*The author directly addresses style by referring to specific language from the text as support. | \* The author addresses the author’s specific use of appeal (logos, pathos, ethos) by quoting and/or paraphrasing the text, using the evidence as support, but has done so more sparingly.\* The author analyzes the appeal/evidence, discussing its effectiveness.\*The author addresses style by referring to word choice and language, using specific examples from the text as support, although infrequently. | \* The author infrequently quotes/paraphrases the article in discussing the effectiveness of evidence/appeals.\* The author’s analysis of the appeals/evidence may be incomplete. \*The author minimally addresses style in the piece. | The  author has not included clear analysis of evidence in their paper. \*The author has not included clear analysis of style in their paper. |
| **Conclusion** | The author thoroughly readdresses the effectiveness of the article. | The author readdresses the effectiveness of the article, though their analysis may lack specificity. | The author does not  effectively readdress the effectiveness the article. | The  author has not included a sufficient conclusion to their paper. |
| **Organization****(X2)**  | Follows the MEAL Plan format throughout; developed logical structure, sophisticated transitions, coherent. | Mostly follows the MEAL Plan format; developed logical structure but may lack transitions or clear topic sentences. | Follows the MEAL Plan format sporadically; structure may lack development, transitions, or clear topic sentences. | Reader has to work too hard to make connections due to absence of transitions & paragraph organization. |
| **Mechanics** | The paper is relatively free of any grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.   It is clear that the final effort has been revised and polished to the best of the author’s abilities. | The paper contains several grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors, though it is clear that the author attempted to revise and polish the paper to the best of their abilities. | The paper contains multiple grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.  It is clear that the author minimally attempted to revise and polish the paper. | The paper contains numerous grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.  It is clear that the author has failed to revise and polish the paper. |
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