

Utah Compose: Narrative Rubric—Teacher Version

Writing Analysis	5	4	3	2	1
Development of Ideas	<p>The response is strongly focused and complete, with a wealth of details to develop real or imagined experiences or events.</p> <p>The writer introduces a narrator and/or characters and establishes a situation.</p> <p>The writer uses narrative techniques such as dialogue and description to fully develop experiences and events or show the response of characters to situations.</p> <p>Support strongly enhances cohesion.</p> <p>The writer takes creative approaches that enhance the response</p>	<p>The response is focused and reasonably complete, with sufficient details to develop real or imagined experiences or events.</p> <p>The writer introduces a narrator and/or characters and generally establishes a situation.</p> <p>The writer uses narrative techniques such as dialogue and description to develop experiences and events or show the response of characters to situations, although development may be uneven.</p> <p>The writer may take creative approaches that enhance the response.</p> <p>Support enhances cohesion.</p>	<p>The response is focused and somewhat complete, with sufficient details to develop real or imagined experiences or events.</p> <p>The story includes a narrator and/or characters.</p> <p>The situation of the narrative may be unclear.</p> <p>Use and control of narrative techniques is uneven.</p> <p>The sequence of events may be somewhat confusing or uneven.</p> <p>Support somewhat enhances cohesion.</p>	<p>The response is weakly focused and lacks development.</p> <p>The response may lack clearly-established characters.</p> <p>The situation of the narrative is unclear or absent.</p> <p>Use and control of narrative techniques is lacking.</p> <p>Details may be general, vague, or inappropriate.</p> <p>The response may display minimal writing.</p> <p>Cohesion may be lacking.</p>	<p>The response lacks focus and development.</p> <p>The response lacks established characters.</p> <p>The situation of the narrative is absent.</p> <p>Details are minimal.</p> <p>The response may be confusing and may display minimal writing.</p> <p>Ideas may be presented randomly.</p>
Organization	<p>The response has a strong vertical and horizontal structure.</p> <p>The organization is specific to task, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The writer provides an event sequence that unfolds naturally and moves smoothly from purposeful introduction to effective conclusion.</p> <p>Effective transitions contribute to unity.</p> <p>Transitions may be transparent and do not interfere with the flow of ideas.</p> <p>There is a strong progression of ideas from sentence to sentence and introduction to conclusion.</p>	<p>The response has a reasonably strong vertical and horizontal structure.</p> <p>The response is generally appropriate to task, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The writer provides an event sequence that unfolds in a generally natural way and moves somewhat smoothly from beginning to conclusion.</p> <p>Some effective transitions are evident that contribute to unity.</p> <p>Transitions may be obvious but they do not interfere with the flow of ideas.</p> <p>There is a progression of ideas from sentence to sentence and introduction to conclusion.</p>	<p>The response has a basic vertical and horizontal structure.</p> <p>The response is somewhat appropriate to task, purpose and audience.</p> <p>The writer provides an event sequence that unfolds unevenly.</p> <p>Some transitions are evident, but they may be artificial and interfere somewhat with the flow of ideas.</p> <p>There is a progression of ideas from introduction to conclusion, but sentence-to-sentence cohesion may be lacking</p>	<p>The response is flawed structurally and disorganized.</p> <p>The response lacks specificity as to task, purpose and/or audience.</p> <p>The sequence of events is confusing and/or uneven or may have insufficient writing to organize.</p> <p>Transitions may be missing or inappropriate.</p> <p>The progression of ideas from beginning to end is disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas</p>	<p>The response is seriously disorganized.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to organize.</p> <p>Transitions may be confusing.</p> <p>The progression of ideas from introduction to conclusion is seriously disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas.</p>
Style	<p>The writer personalizes the topic and forms a strong connection with the audience by demonstrating a strong sense of purpose and appropriateness to task and audience.</p> <p>The writer's voice comes through the composition and strengthens the connection with the audience.</p> <p>Compositional risks are successful and enhance the response.</p> <p>The communication with the audience is strong without seeming forced.</p>	<p>The writer forms a reasonably successful connection with the audience and has awareness of purpose.</p> <p>There is evidence of voice and awareness of the audience.</p> <p>Compositional risks, if evident, are reasonably successful.</p> <p>The communication with the audience is evident and does not seem forced.</p>	<p>The writer's connection with the audience and purpose is uneven.</p> <p>The response may be mundane and lack voice.</p> <p>Compositional risks, if evident, are only partially successful.</p> <p>The writer may not demonstrate awareness of the audience or the writing may seem somewhat artificial.</p>	<p>The writer's connection with the audience and purpose is weak.</p> <p>The response has a weak awareness of the audience and lacks voice.</p> <p>The response is pedestrian and may be formulaic.</p> <p>Any reaching out to the audience is disruptive to the flow of the response.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to develop a connection with the audience</p>	<p>The writer demonstrates little to no sense of the audience or the purpose of the topic.</p> <p>The response is disconnected from the context and may have vague or random events or ideas.</p> <p>The response may be difficult for the audience to understand.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to develop a connection with the audience.</p>

Writing Analysis	5	4	3	2	1
Word Choice	<p>Words are used in a precise and sophisticated way to enhance and convey experiences and events.</p> <p>The response has evidence of precise vocabulary that is beyond grade level.</p> <p>Word selection provides a vivid picture of the experiences, events, setting, and/or characters.</p> <p>Words have impact and are used with efficiency.</p> <p>The writer's choice of words effectively brings the narrative to life.</p>	<p>Words enhance the development of the narrative.</p> <p>The response may have evidence of vocabulary that is beyond grade level.</p> <p>Word selection provides a picture of experiences, events, setting, and/or characters.</p> <p>Words are well chosen and are used somewhat efficiently.</p> <p>The writer's choice of words brings the narrative to life.</p>	<p>Words are adequate to develop the narrative.</p> <p>There are few words that are beyond grade level.</p> <p>Word selection is a mix of general and specific and may not support development of experiences, events, setting, and/or characters.</p> <p>Wordiness may be evident as the writer tries to relate ideas.</p> <p>The writer's choice of words may be mundane.</p>	<p>Words are not adequate to develop the narrative.</p> <p>Vocabulary is basic and may be inaccurate.</p> <p>Word selection is primarily general.</p> <p>Wordiness and repetition disrupt the flow of ideas.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to indicate adequate word choice.</p>	<p>Words are not adequate to develop the narrative and may be incorrect.</p> <p>Vocabulary is basic and may be confusing to the audience.</p> <p>Word selection is general and vague.</p> <p>Wordiness and repetition disrupt the flow of ideas.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to indicate adequate word choice</p>
Sentence Structure	<p>Sentences are complex and varied.</p> <p>Sentence construction contributes to a strong sense of fluency.</p> <p>Attempts at sophistication are successful.</p> <p>Combinations of sentence structures enhance cohesion and promote strong expression.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors in sentence construction.</p>	<p>Sentences are varied.</p> <p>Sentence construction contributes to fluency.</p> <p>Attempts at sophistication are for the most part successful.</p> <p>Combinations of sentence structures are evident and ease reading.</p> <p>There are few errors in sentence construction.</p>	<p>Sentences are only occasionally varied.</p> <p>Sentence construction is repetitive and mechanical.</p> <p>Attempts at sophistication are not evident.</p> <p>Combinations of sentence structures are lacking.</p> <p>Awkward sentences create some minor interruptions.</p> <p>There are errors in sentence construction, including run-ons and fragments, but they do not seriously disrupt the presentation.</p>	<p>Sentences are simple and lack variety.</p> <p>Sentence construction is elemental.</p> <p>The response consists of simple structures.</p> <p>Awkward sentences create interruptions.</p> <p>There are errors in sentence construction, including run-ons and fragments that seriously disrupt the presentation.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to evaluate sentence structure.</p>	<p>Sentences are simple and errors create confusion.</p> <p>Command of sentences is still emerging.</p> <p>The response consists of simple structures.</p> <p>Awkward sentences create confusion and require deciphering on the part of the audience.</p> <p>There are errors in sentence construction, including run-ons and fragments that seriously disrupt the response.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to evaluate sentence structure.</p>
Conventions	<p>The writer demonstrates a strong command of grammar, usage, and mechanics.</p> <p>Grammar and usage are generally correct and demonstrate complexity.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors in spelling, and the student successfully attempts to spell complex words.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors in punctuation</p>	<p>The writer demonstrates a reasonably strong command of grammar, usage, and mechanics.</p> <p>Grammar and usage are for the most part correct.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors in spelling.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors in punctuation.</p>	<p>The writer demonstrates a command of grammar, usage, and mechanics but some errors may be evident.</p> <p>Errors in grammar and usage while evident are not widespread in proportion to the amount of writing.</p> <p>Simple words are spelled correctly.</p> <p>Incorrect spelling does not disrupt the reading of the response.</p> <p>There may be errors in mechanics, particularly in comma use.</p>	<p>Errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics but some errors disrupt the reading of the response.</p> <p>Errors in grammar and usage are numerous in proportion to the amount of writing and may create interruptions in reading the response.</p> <p>Spelling errors may be prevalent and require some deciphering on the part of the audience.</p> <p>Errors in mechanics may be evident.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to evaluate conventions.</p>	<p>Numerous errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics create confusion.</p> <p>Errors in grammar and usage are numerous in proportion to the amount of writing and create confusion for the audience.</p> <p>Spelling errors may be prevalent and require deciphering on the part of the audience.</p> <p>Errors in the basics of mechanics may be evident.</p> <p>Awkward sentences create confusion and require deciphering on the part of the audience.</p> <p>The response may have insufficient writing to evaluate conventions.</p>