

## Analysis of an Argument

Score	Rating	Characteristics of a Typical Paper with This Score
6	Outstanding—a cogent, well-articulated critique of the argument, demonstrating mastery of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clearly identifies and insightfully analyzes important features of the argument</li> <li>• develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them smoothly with clear transitions</li> <li>• effectively supports the main points of the critique</li> <li>• demonstrates superior control of language, including diction and syntactic variety and the conventions of standard written English. There may be minor flaws</li> </ul>
5	Strong—a well-developed critique of the argument, demonstrating good control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clearly identifies important features of the argument and analyzes them in a generally thoughtful way</li> <li>• develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions</li> <li>• sensibly supports the main points of the critique</li> <li>• demonstrates clear control of language, including diction and syntactic variety</li> <li>• demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, but may have minor flaws</li> </ul>
4	Adequate—a competent critique of the argument, demonstrating adequate control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifies and capably analyzes important features of the argument</li> <li>• develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily, but may not always connect them with transitions</li> <li>• supports the main points of</li> </ul>

		<p>the critique</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrates adequate control of language, including diction and syntactic variety, but may lack syntactic variety</li> <li>• displays control of the conventions of standard written English, but may have some flaws</li> </ul>
3	Limited—a competent but clearly flawed critique of the argument, demonstrating some control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not identify or analyze most of the important features of the argument, although some analysis is present</li> <li>• is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas</li> <li>• offers support of little relevance and value for points of the critique</li> <li>• uses language imprecisely and/or lacks sentence variety</li> <li>• contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics</li> </ul>
2	Seriously flawed—a paper demonstrating serious weakness in analytical writing skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fails to show an understanding of and does not identify or analyze the main features of the argument</li> <li>• does not develop ideas or is disorganized</li> <li>• provides few, if any, relevant or reasonable support</li> <li>• has serious, frequent problems in the use of language and sentence structure</li> <li>• contains numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics that interfere with meaning</li> </ul>
1	Fundamentally Deficient—a paper demonstrating fundamental deficiencies in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze the argument or to</li> </ul>

	analytical writing skills.	develop an organized response to it <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure</li><li>• contains a pervasive pattern of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, thus resulting in incoherence</li></ul>
0	Unscorable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a paper that is totally illegible or obviously not written on the assigned topic</li></ul>