

KAMM WRITING ASSESSMENT – EXPOSITORY SCORING RUBRIC

IDEAS AND CONTENT

Rating of 3

- ❑ **Main Ideas:** clear and focused; central idea is present and well-defined; secondary ideas are supporting and relevant
- ❑ **Development:** details provide adequate support of main idea from 2 or more sources (observations, prior knowledge, personal experiences); details are accurate, clearly defined, and largely in control of the topic
- ❑ **Addresses Readers' Needs:** informs the reader; explains topic in understandable terms; completely addresses all of the prompt questions
- ❑ **Knowledge & Originality:** knowledge or experience of topic is evident; main ideas relate directly to personal experiences

Rating of 2

- ❑ **Main Ideas:** central idea is identifiable but not focused; secondary ideas are loosely tied to the topic but may not be completely relevant
- ❑ **Development:** details provide support of main idea from at least 1 source; details are sketchy or general; reads more like a list of supporting ideas
- ❑ **Addresses Readers' Needs:** only addresses half of the prompt questions and some questions are left not adequately addressed; rarely responds to readers' informational needs
- ❑ **Knowledge & Originality:** knowledge of topic is limited; experience of topic is not clearly stated

Rating of 1

- ❑ **Main Ideas:** no central idea is present; topic is unclear
- ❑ **Development:** details are missing, repetitious, or unrelated; no sense of direction
- ❑ **Addresses Readers' Needs:** fails to address any of the prompt questions; leaves the reader confused
- ❑ **Knowledge & Originality:** lack of knowledge; no linked personal experiences

ORGANIZATION

Rating of 3

- ❑ **Structure:** the paper has a recognizable beginning, middle, and end; paragraphing groups ideas together effectively
- ❑ **Pacing & Sequencing:** sequencing is logical and details fit where they are placed; text is easy to understand and follow; ideas are well connected
- ❑ **Introduction & Conclusion:** the introduction clearly states the main idea; the conclusion restates the main idea effectively; both the introduction and the conclusion are recognizable
- ❑ **Transitions:** the writer moves the reader from idea to idea naturally and effectively; the reader can see how he or she got from one idea to the next in the writing

Rating of 2

- ❑ **Structure:** the paper has a clear beginning or end but not both; paragraphing groups some ideas together effectively, but not all ideas are grouped effectively
- ❑ **Pacing & Sequencing:** details are appropriate and have purpose but could be sequenced in a more effective manner; text could be easier for the reader to follow
- ❑ **Introduction & Conclusion:** either the introduction or conclusion is present and clear, or if both the introduction and conclusion are present; they do not effectively state the main idea
- ❑ **Transitions:** connections between ideas are sometimes awkward; the reader is confused about how he or she got from one idea to the next in the writing

Rating of 1

- ❑ **Structure:** the paper has no recognizable beginning or end; paragraphing is not attempted or appears to be random
- ❑ **Pacing & Sequencing:** details do not fit where they are placed; text is difficult to understand and follow
- ❑ **Introduction & Conclusion:** neither the introduction nor conclusion is present or recognizable
- ❑ **Transitions:** ideas are not connected; the reader is reading isolated facts

Note: Once a piece of writing is scoring fairly consistently in the “3” range, moving to the five-point writing rubric is suggested.

KAMM WRITING ASSESSMENT – EXPOSITORY SCORING RUBRIC

VOICE

Rating of 3

- **Energy & Passion:** the writing is enthusiastic, honest, and individualistic
- **Presentation of Ideas:** language is interesting with some moments of amusement, surprise, and enlightenment
- **Writer’s Involvement:** the writer’s intent for the passage is clear; reveals some details about the writer; writer is willing to express feeling or emotion
- **Audience Awareness:** clearly written for an audience and to be read; understands the audience

Rating of 2

- **Energy & Passion:** the writing is personable but not compelling; the writing shows limited enthusiasm
- **Presentation of Ideas:** moments of amusement, surprise, and enlightenment are overshadowed by lack of details
- **Writer’s Involvement:** the writer’s intent for the passage is clear in places, but not overall; writer expresses feeling or emotion, but only in places
- **Audience Awareness:** limited awareness of the audience; reader must work at remaining engaged and is left wanting more from the writer

Rating of 1

- **Energy & Passion:** writing is flat, lifeless, and mechanical; the writing shows no enthusiasm
- **Presentation of Ideas:** no moments of amusement, surprise, and enlightenment are shown
- **Writer’s Involvement:** the writer’s intent for the passage is not clear; writer does not express any feeling or emotion
- **Audience Awareness:** no attempt to involve reader; reader must work hard to pay attention and gain needed information

WORD CHOICE

Rating of 3

- **Accuracy:** experiments with uncommon words and generally uses them effectively; words convey the intended message
- **Specificity:** any specialized vocabulary used is explained adequately
- **Descriptiveness:** descriptive adjectives and adverbs are used to enhance meaning; verbs, vivid modifiers, imagery, or figurative language are used effectively
- **Appeal:** words convey the message in a realistic and reasonable way; some words capture the reader’s imagination

Rating of 2

- **Accuracy:** occasionally uses uncommon words, which may interfere with the meaning
- **Specificity:** specialized vocabulary is used but is not explained
- **Descriptiveness:** repetitive, dull verbs and a few modifiers are used; more details are needed
- **Appeal:** words convey ideas but lack expanded vocabulary and do not capture the reader’s imagination

Rating of 1

- **Accuracy:** writer struggles with a limited vocabulary; searching for words to convey the message; incorrect and inappropriate words confuse the meaning and readers
- **Specificity:** vague and abstract words (e.g. “It was fun,” “It was nice and stuff”) make it difficult for the reader to extract the message
- **Descriptiveness:** passive verbs and no modifiers are used; no specific details are given
- **Appeal:** words do not convey the message; limited vocabulary; the reader is bored with the writing

Note: Once a piece of writing is scoring fairly consistently in the “3” range, moving to the five-point writing rubric is suggested.

KAMM WRITING ASSESSMENT – EXPOSITORY SCORING RUBRIC

SENTENCE FLUENCY

Rating of 3

- **Reading Ease:** one sentence flows effortlessly into the next; invites expressive oral reading
- **Structure:** writer shows control over simple sentence structure and attempts compound and/or complex sentences; run-ons and fragments may be used if they improve fluency
- **Variety:** varied lengths, structures, and patterns
- **Sentence Beginnings:** varied word usage; moves readers from one sentence to the next

Rating of 2

- **Reading Ease:** some parts of text invite expressive oral reading; others parts of text may be stiff, choppy, or awkward
- **Structure:** shows control over simple sentence structure only; no compound or complex sentences are used; some run-ons and/or fragments appear
- **Variety:** some variation of length and structure; tends to favor a particular pattern
- **Sentence Beginnings:** limited attempt at sentence beginnings; frequently favors a particular beginning

Rating of 1

- **Reading Ease:** paper is difficult to follow or to read aloud; most sentences tend to be choppy, incomplete, rambling, awkward
- **Structure:** persistent run-ons and/or fragments
- **Variety:** little or no variety in length or structure; word patterns are monotonous
- **Sentence Beginnings:** repetitive patterns tire readers (“I believe,” “I think”, “I feel,” ...)

CONVENTIONS

Rating of 3

- **Control:** control over a small range of standard spelling, usage, and grammar conventions; grammar and usage problems are not serious enough to distort meaning
- **Error Frequency:** control over conventions, with few errors to distract the reader; errors do not distort the meaning of the passage
- **Punctuation:** terminal (end-of-sentence) punctuation is typically correct; internal punctuation is attempted and is often used correctly
- **Publication Readiness:** more thorough editing is still needed

Rating of 2

- **Control:** limited control over a small range of standard spelling, usage, and grammar conventions; problems with grammar and usage distort meaning in some places
- **Error Frequency:** errors are numerous or serious enough to distract the reader frequently and distort meaning
- **Punctuation:** terminal punctuation is sometimes correct; internal punctuation is rarely correct or is missing
- **Publication Readiness:** substantial editing is still required

Rating of 1

- **Control:** no control over standard spelling, usage, and grammar conventions; problems with grammar and usage distort meaning
- **Error Frequency:** continually distracts reader; reader must read once to decode, then read again for meaning
- **Punctuation:** both terminal and internal punctuation are often missing or incorrect
- **Publication Readiness:** extensive editing is required

Note: Once a piece of writing is scoring fairly consistently in the “3” range, moving to the five-point writing rubric is suggested.