Lit Analysis Rubric NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DISTINGUISHED** | **PROFICIENT** | **EMERGING** | **NEEDS IMRPOVEMENT** |
| **FOCUS** | * Thesis expertly sets purpose and is articulately worded * Topic sentences expertly preview main ideas and relate fully to thesis * Intro expertly sets context (title, author, topic) * Evidence/explanation highly reflective of thesis | * Thesis adequately sets purpose and is clearly worded * Topic sentences sufficiently preview main ideas and adequately reflect thesis * Intro sufficiently sets context * Evidence/explanation sufficiently reflective of thesis | * Thesis may not be clear in purpose or significance * Topic sentences may be unclear in main ideas or relation to thesis * Intro may not set a clear context or may be missing aspects * Evidence/explanation questionable in link to thesis | * Thesis maybe absent or in the wrong place * Topic sentences are missing main ideas and/or relation to thesis * Intro is missing context * Evidence/explanation not related to thesis |
| **CONTENT** | * Hook is an immediate grabber and is thoroughly addressed/ expertly connected to novel/topic * Examples/evidence highly insightful * Analysis is articulate, comprehensive, and perceptive with no plot summary * Evidence of thoughtful, purposeful, thorough revision * Conclusion includes an original, thoughtful “so what” | * Hook is somewhat interesting and clear in development/ connection to novel/topic * Examples/evidence sufficiently chosen for strength of insight * Analysis is clear, developed, and accurate with little to no plot summary * Evidence of appropriate revision steps * Conclusion includes a satisfactory “so what” | * Hook is perfunctory/dull and may not be connected to novel/topic * Examples/evidence may be weak/questionably chosen * Analysis may be imbalanced and/or demonstrate misunderstanding with some plot summary * Revision efforts appear minimal * Conclusion includes a basic or rote “so what” | * Hook is missing * Examples/evidence weak * Examples/evidence are weak/ inaccurate * Analysis is absent, under-developed, indicative of misunderstanding and/or marred by plot summary * Revision efforts are incomplete/ non-existent * Conclusion lacks a “so what” |
| **ORGANIZATION** | * Information is expertly/ purposefully arranged for ease of reading, progression of thought, and fluency * Transitions are masterfully employed * Clinchers succinctly and clearly conclude paragraphs | * Information is sufficiently arranged for reading clarity, progression of thought, and fluency * Transitions are skillfully employed * Clinchers are adequate in concluding paragraphs | * Information may be out of order, illogically arranged, confusing, or disconnected * Transitions may be inconsistent * Clinchers may be inconsistent in concluding paragraphs | * Information may lack any logical presentation or coherence * Transitions may be abrupt or absent * Clinchers are absent |
| **STYLE/**  **MECHANICS** | * Mechanics are masterfully employed with few to no errors * Citations are correct * Syntax and diction are masterfully varied and sophisticated with expert attention to specific lit analysis points (tense, contractions, word jails) | * Mechanics are sufficiently employed with some to few errors * Citations are mostly correct * Syntax and diction are varied and correct with adequate attention to specific lit analysis points | * Mechanics may include multiple errors * Citations contain few/minor errors * Syntax and diction may be dull or awkward with inconsistent to little attention to specific lit analysis points | * Mechanics may include multiple errors that interfere with meaning * Citations are absent or contain serious errors * Syntax and diction may be so confusing as to interfere with meaning with little to no attention to specific lit analysis points |