

Name: _____

Date: _____

Composition Profile (111 & 112)				
	Score	LEVEL	CRITERIA	COMMENTS
CONTENT		20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development • relevant to assigned topic	
		17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail	
		13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic	
		9-7	VERT POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR, not enough to evaluate	
ORGANIZATION		20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly state/supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive	
		17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • logical but incomplete sequencing	
		13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development	
		9-7	VERT POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR, not enough to evaluate	
VOCABULARY		30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register	
		26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
		21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		16-13	VERT POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR, not enough to evaluate	
LANGUAGE		25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
		21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
		17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negations, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		10-5	VERT POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR, not enough to evaluate	
MECHANICS		5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing	
		4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
		3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		2	VERT POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • OR, not enough to evaluate	
TOTAL SCORE		READER COMMENTS		

Name: _____

Date: _____

Composition Profile (211)				
	Score	LEVEL	CRITERIA	COMMENTS
CONTENT		30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development • relevant to assigned topic	
		26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail	
		21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic	
		16-13	VERT POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR, not enough to evaluate	
ORGANIZATION		20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly state/supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive	
		17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • logical but incomplete sequencing	
		13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development	
		9-7	VERT POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR, not enough to evaluate	
VOCABULARY		20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register	
		17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
		13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		9-7	VERT POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR, not enough to evaluate	
LANGUAGE		25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
		21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
		17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negations, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		10-5	VERT POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR, not enough to evaluate	
MECHANICS		5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing	
		4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
		3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
		2	VERT POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • OR, not enough to evaluate	
TOTAL SCORE		READER COMMENTS		

Evaluation and Grading of Student Writing

Teacher response to students' written compositions has typically taken two forms: (1) corrective feedback on the microlevel and (2) an overall evaluation in the form of a grade. There are two principle types of scoring in the evaluation of compositions: holistic scoring and analytical scoring.

Holistic Scoring: When one is attempting to assess the overall proficiency level of a given written sample, holistic scoring has the highest construct validity. In this type of scoring procedure, one or more readers assigns a single grade (or rating) to a text based on an overall impression. The criteria involved in producing this impression might include some of the following:

- (a) the clarity with which the thesis is stated, developed, and supported;
- (b) the effectiveness with which an issue has been raised, treated, and resolved;
- (c) the sufficiency of the support and development of the thesis for the reader;
- (d) the degree to which the writer has accommodated the needs of the intended audience;
- (e) the degree of grammatical and lexical cohesion and overall coherence of the piece;
- (f) the effective use of rhetorical devices, etc.

Generally, holistic evaluation is done quickly and impressionistically. Papers can be scored holistically for prominence of certain features considered to be important for the type of writing assigned. The evaluation can be in the form of a letter or number grade. One of the drawbacks of holistic scoring is that they can be highly subjective. In addition, fatigue factors, previous acquaintance with the student, and shifting standards from one paper to the next can lead to unreliable scoring.

Analytical Scoring: This technique involves the separation of the various features of a composition into components for scoring purposes. One advantage of scoring features separately, especially in classroom instruction, is that more precise diagnostic feedback can be provided to the student. Because the teacher's criteria are more focused, grading tends to be more reliable as well. The score sheet has been adjusted to reflect weightings that are more suitable for Beginner-level learners (111 & 112) and Intermediate-level learners (211).