

## Soph Honors Literary Analysis Writing Rubric

	Interpretation	Evidence	Structure and Cohesion	Style and Conventions
Exceeds	Analysis is <b>persuasive</b> , insightful and perceptive; sophisticated ideas are expressed with clarity and skill. Skillfully addresses all aspects of the prompt, presenting a convincing reading of the text.	Excellent use of thoughtfully chosen, apt, and specific concrete details and references to the text that persuasively reinforce and elaborate upon the claim.	Well organized with careful development; excellent primary claim/thesis; logically ordered and persistently focused with smooth transitions within and between paragraphs; strong conclusion.	Exceptionally well-written with stylistic flair, with pleasing sentence variety, sound sentence structure, precise and fresh diction. Uses the literary present. No significant errors in conventions such as spelling, grammar, usage, and mechanics.
Meets	Analysis is <b>reasonable</b> : fairly thoughtful and convincing, competent but less insightful and less developed than above. Reflects a sustained, competent reading that is free from significant or sustained misinterpretations.	Effectively uses well-chosen and specific concrete details and references to the text that reasonably reinforce and elaborate upon the claim. Evidence is less thorough, precise, and/or perceptive than above.	Sound organization; intelligent but less effective primary claim/thesis; logically ordered; focused; good use of transitions; effective conclusion.	Competent and well-written, with some sentence variety; good sentence structure, high-level and varied diction. Uses the literary present most of the time. Few errors in conventions—spelling, grammar, usage, and mechanics.
Developing	Analysis is <b>plausible</b> : generic, simplistic, but contains some analysis. Displays writer’s ideas in an overly generalized fashion, perhaps formulaic. May miss the complexity of the work.	Contains and uses concrete details and textual references correctly, but they may be superficial, obvious, and/or vague in their relevance to the claim. Often includes summary with some analysis.	Recognizable organization with adequate primary claim/thesis and some transitions, but may not address the complexity of the prompt, be logically ordered, maintain focus, or have adequate conclusion.	May have some, but not serious, errors in conventions. Some evidence of a writer’s voice but not one of a unique nature. Adequate control of language.
Approaching	Analysis is <b>weak</b> : misguided, inaccurate, and/or unclear. Addresses the topic but presents an incomplete, oversimplified understanding of the work. Response fails to adequately address the entire question.	Contains some supporting evidence, but it is weak, summarized, vague, repetitive, or inaccurate. The connection of evidence to claim is weak. Relies more on plot summary than analysis or on plot summary alone.	Paper shows some sense of organization, with imprecise primary claim/thesis or merely a restatement of the question; ideas may drift from or are not connected to the claim or prompt; may lack transitions and effective topic sentences; weak conclusion.	Little sentence variety; sentence structure errors, generic and/or repetitive diction. Weak control over conventions. Significant wordy, repetitious, and/or awkward constructions.
Inadequate	Plot summary substitutes for commentary and analysis; some attempt to answer the question, but with very little clarity or coherence.	Very little, if any, concrete details and textual support; if present, evidence is unacceptably vague and/or brief.	Lack of control over organization; may ramble; primary claim/thesis is weak or nonexistent.	Little sentence variety; may have distracting errors in sentence structure and diction. Weak control and distracting errors in conventions.