**Informative Synthesis Essay Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Excellent**  **90-100%** | | **Good**  **80-89%** | **Acceptable**  **70-79%** | **Needs Improvement**  **60-69%** | **Unacceptable/ Missing**  **0-50%** |
| **Document Format** | Document is in correct file type (doc, docx, odt) with proper MLA formatting throughout. | | Document is in correct file type with minor MLA formatting errors. | Document is in correct file type with several MLA formatting errors. | Document is in correct file type but lacks basic MLA formatting. | Document is in incorrect file type or completely lacks MLA formatting. |
| **Length Requirements** | Essay meets or exceeds the 3-page requirement (exclusive of Works Cited page) with substantive content. | | Essay meets the 3-page requirement (exclusive of Works Cited) with adequate content. | Essay barely meets the 3-page requirement with minimal content. | Essay falls slightly short of 3 pages. | Essay falls significantly short of the 3-page requirement. |
| **Topic Introduction** | Introduction skillfully guides reader into the subject with compelling context and smooth narrowing to the specific focus. | | Introduction effectively introduces the subject and narrows to the specific focus. | Introduction adequately presents the subject but could transition more smoothly to the specific focus. | Introduction presents the subject but fails to narrow or focus effectively. | Introduction is missing, off-topic, or fails to introduce the subject. |
| **Thesis Statement** | Thesis is exceptionally clear, sophisticated, and precisely states why understanding the aspects of the topic are important. | | Thesis is clear and effectively states why understanding the aspects of the topic are important. | Thesis is present and states why understanding the topic is important, but lacks some clarity or precision. | Thesis is present but vague, oversimplified, or doesn't adequately address importance. | Thesis is missing, unclear, or completely ineffective. |
| **Source Requirements** | Uses 4 or more high-quality college-level sources, including at least 2 from assigned readings, with perfect balance and integration. | | Uses 4 appropriate college-level sources, including at least 2 from assigned readings, with good balance. | Uses 4 sources with at least 2 from assigned readings, but quality or balance could be improved. | Uses fewer than 4 sources or doesn't include 2 from assigned readings. | Uses fewer than 3 sources or no sources from assigned readings. |
| **Source Integration** | Sources are seamlessly integrated using varied and sophisticated signal phrases and transitions. | | Sources are well-integrated using effective signal phrases and transitions. | Sources are adequately integrated with basic signal phrases but transitions could be improved. | Sources are poorly integrated with awkward signal phrases or dropped quotations. | Sources are not integrated with signal phrases; quotations are dropped or missing. |
| **MLA Citations** | Perfect MLA parenthetical citations throughout. | | Mostly correct MLA parenthetical citations with minor errors. | Adequate MLA parenthetical citations with several errors. | Inconsistent or frequently incorrect MLA parenthetical citations. | Parenthetical citations missing or completely incorrect. |
| **Paragraph Structure** | Paragraphs are expertly introduced with seamless integration of credibility, context, and topic positioning. | | Paragraphs are well-introduced with good integration of credibility, context, and topic positioning. | Paragraphs have adequate introductions but may lack smooth integration of all elements. | Paragraph introductions are weak, abrupt, or missing key contextual elements. | Paragraphs lack proper introductions or organizational structure. |
| **Evidence Explanation** | Consistently provides insightful explanation of how evidence illuminates the issue with exceptional depth and clarity. | | Generally explains how evidence helps understand the issue with good insight. | Basic explanation of how evidence relates to the issue, but lacks depth or consistency. | Minimal explanation of how evidence relates to the issue; often presents evidence without analysis. | Fails to explain how evidence relates to the issue; evidence stands alone without analysis. |
| **Alternative Viewpoints** | When appropriate, thoroughly addresses opposing views with fairness and insight. | | When appropriate, adequately addresses opposing views. | When appropriate, mentions opposing views but treatment may be superficial. | Minimal acknowledgment of opposing views when they should be addressed. | Completely ignores relevant opposing views. |
| **Logical Organization** | Organization expertly guides readers through a sophisticated thinking process toward understanding the topic. | | Organization effectively guides readers through a clear thinking process. | Organization is adequate but the thinking process could be more clearly developed. | Organization is inconsistent, making the thinking process difficult to follow. | Organization is illogical or absent, failing to guide readers through any clear thinking process. |
| **Goes Beyond Restatement** | Conclusion masterfully extends beyond thesis restatement to provide insightful commentary on the broader significance in today's society. | | Conclusion goes beyond thesis restatement to provide thoughtful commentary on broader significance. | Conclusion goes somewhat beyond thesis restatement but could develop broader significance more fully. | Conclusion mostly restates thesis with minimal insight into broader significance. | Conclusion merely restates thesis or is missing entirely. |
| **Academic Voice** | Consistently maintains sophisticated formal academic voice with no personal language (I/me/my/you/your), perfect tone, and precise word choice. | | Maintains formal academic voice with no personal language, appropriate tone, and effective word choice. | Generally maintains academic voice with few instances of personal language and mostly appropriate tone and word choice. | Inconsistent academic voice with several instances of personal language or informal tone/word choice. | Frequently uses personal language or consistently employs informal tone/word choice inappropriate for academic writing. |
| **Grammar and Mechanics** | Flawless grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure throughout. | | Strong grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure with minimal errors. | Adequate grammar and mechanics with some errors that don't significantly impede understanding. | Noticeable grammar and mechanical errors that sometimes impede understanding. | Frequent and serious grammar and mechanical errors that significantly impede understanding. |
| **MLA Formatting** | Perfect MLA formatting for all sources on Works Cited page. | | Mostly correct MLA formatting with minor errors. | Adequate MLA formatting with several errors. | Significant MLA formatting errors throughout Works Cited page. | No proper MLA formatting used on Works Cited page. |
| **Source Inclusion** | All sources cited in essay are perfectly documented on Works Cited page. | | All sources cited in essay are included on Works Cited page with minor documentation issues. | All sources cited in essay are included on Works Cited page but with inconsistent documentation. | Some sources cited in essay are missing from Works Cited page. | Many sources cited in essay are missing from Works Cited page. |
| **Timeliness, Professionalism, and Extra Credit** | | | | | | |
| Grammarly Report | | -10 points if missing or if obvious advice was ignored | | | | |
| Late Submission | | Points deducted based on lateness | | | | |
| Writing Center Visit | | +5 points for documented Writing Center assistance | | | | |
| **Grade and Feedback** | | | | | | |
| Overall average: | |  | | | | |
| General strengths, and areas to develop and improve in future writing: | |  | | | | |