

## Literary Journalism Rubric\*

	Superior (A Range)	Good (B Range)	Competent (C+ or C)	Non-Passing (C- and Below)
Conceptual	Shows notable command of conceptual tasks required by assignment; articulates between interviewee's and writer's points of view; sophisticated use of conventions of Literary Journalism	Shows a good understanding of the ideas and methods of the assignment; represents both the interviewee's and the writer's points of view; competent use of the conventions of Literary Journalism	Shows an understanding of the basic ideas and information involved in the assignment; may not successfully represent two points of view; shows sufficient competence in the conventions of Literary Journalism	Shows inadequate command of basic ideas and information involved in the assignment; does not represent two points of view; unresponsive to the specific writing situation
Rhetorical	Features nuanced, detailed narration that shows (rather than tells) events to the reader; writer's approach to the story is vivid and compelling, showing originality and strong awareness of audience; transitions fluidly between different perspectives and moments; anticipates the reader's needs for information, explanation, and relevant historical/cultural context; defines terms.	Fairly detailed narration that mostly shows events; author's approach to the story is compelling, showing good awareness of audience; transitions between different perspectives and moments; addresses the reader's needs for information, explanation, and relevant historical/cultural context; defines terms.	Adequate narration; may be lacking in detail or may rely too heavily upon summary; makes some attempt to tell a compelling story; only partially transitions between different perspectives and moments; displays adequate audience awareness; signals the importance of the reader's needs for information, explanation, and context. May not define terms clearly.	Inadequate narration; story may consist almost entirely of generalities or summary; shows serious weaknesses in addressing an audience; inadequate transitions between perspectives and moments; fails to provide, or provides irrelevant, information, explanation and historical/cultural context; may define terms incorrectly.
Structure	Clearly articulated focus is followed throughout essay; main "story" is clear and consistently pursued through description; each paragraph has a particular focus and cohesively develops a specific point; relation between paragraphs signaled via smooth, relevant transitions; reader can easily follow logical progression of thought.	Focus is followed throughout essay; main "story" is consistently pursued; majority of paragraphs have a particular focus and cohesively develop a specific point; relation between paragraphs signaled via logical progression of thought.	Focus is largely followed throughout; main "story" is evident but not always consistently pursued; at least half the paragraphs have a particular focus and cohesively develop a specific point; relation between paragraphs usually signaled via transitions; reader can follow logical progression of thought.	Essay lacks focus/ structural components; main "story" is not evident; fewer paragraphs have a particular focus and cohesively develop a specific point; relation between paragraphs rarely signaled via transitions; reader has difficulty following progression of thought.
Language	Exceptionally well-crafted and clear; few errors; gracefully integrated quotations; well-edited, largely free of error; words used with economy and precision; connotative use of language; rhetorically sensitive sentence structure and variety	Well-crafted and clear; few errors, but not superior prose; integrated quotations; well-edited, largely free of error; words usually used with economy and precision; some connotative use of language; varied sentence structure	Evidence of editing; errors exist but don't hamper readability; quotations not always integrated; some use of economy and precision; little connotative use of language; mostly varied sentence structure	Errors detract from readability; few, if any, integrated quotations; little use of economy and precision, no connotative use of language; simple sentence structure
Ethos	Convincing credibility; essay shows writer is expert on the story's topic; exhibits a complex, nuanced point of view; expertly crafted narrative voice.	Convincing credibility; essay shows writer is knowledgeable on the story's topic; exhibits a specific point of view; consistent narrative voice	Largely convincing credibility; essay shows some knowledge of the story's topic; doesn't always exhibit a specific point of view; somewhat inconsistent narrative voice	Unconvincing credibility in one or more ways; exhibits numerous points of view (inconsistency of narrative voice)