

## ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR OIB AMERICAN OPTION WRITTEN EXAMINATION: THE COMMENTARY

*N.B.* A short response may require assessment to be lowered.

Category	Below Level -0.5 or more at the discretion of the examiner	Level 0	Level 1 + 0.5	Level 2 + 1.0	Level 3 +1.5	Level 4 +2.0
Understanding the Text	Flawed to seriously flawed understanding. No awareness of levels of meaning, such as effect of voice or tone.	Basic denotative understanding. Fanciful or ineffective attempt to find meaning on another level.	Fair but awkward understanding of much of the text. Plausible sense of deeper meaning. Some sense of voice/tone.	Fair understanding with coherent sense of some deeper meaning in much of the text. Accurate sense of voice/tone.	Good understanding of whole text, including the use of voice, tone and levels of meaning.	Excellent interpretation. Shows understanding of complexity and subtleties implied by text.
Analysis & Use of the Text	A paraphrase or superficial commentary with little to no textual basis. No attempt at analysis.	Superficial commentary with some textual basis. Little or fuzzy analysis. May summarize rather than analyze, or struggle to prove anything.	Satisfactory analysis of some textual features. Relevant but limited use of text, or a mix of relevant and irrelevant.	Satisfactory analysis of several important textual features. Mostly relevant use of text that provides evidence of deeper meaning.	Good analysis supports commentary throughout. Quotes well chosen and pertinent. Probes the meaning of the text.	Insightful analysis. Textual usage full and telling. Commentary digs far beyond the obvious.
Appreciation of Literary Features	Appreciation of literary features absent or fanciful. No accurate use of literary terminology.	Some notion of voice or other literary features, but comments are inaccurate or scarce. No apparent ability to relate these to meaning.	Limited sense of literary features. Relevant stylistic devices may be accurately identified, but discussion is often superficial or relation to meaning very hit and miss.	Good sense of some literary features. Several relevant devices are identified and discussed. A few comments may be awkward or inconsistent.	Good sense of text as literature. Includes real discussion of style with varied use of terminology. Good ability to relate style to meaning.	Excellent appreciation of literary features. Comments grounded in style with use of precise, detailed terminology. Discussion always directed at meaning.
Organization	No development of any argument. Incoherent, strictly linear, or simply rambling paragraphs.	Weak structure. Little development or too short. Some ordering of ideas but logical flow or focus is broken.	Some evidence of good structure, but overall development remains unfocused, mechanical or clumsy.	Mostly coherent structure. Paragraphs have clear focus, but the whole lacks some development.	Coherent, well developed paragraphs. Good use of commentary structure.	Flowing and persuasive paragraphs. Elegant and effective use of commentary structure.
Expression	Meaning often cannot be surmised. Commentary difficult to read due to consistent mistakes.	Prose can be read and meaning surmised, but expression frequently shows weak control (or French interference).	Prose mostly conveys the writer's ideas, but language can be clumsy, heavy or marred by errors amidst a sometimes clear expression.	Prose mostly clear and coherent. Minor lapses, even if frequent, do not impede understanding. Some care and consistency shown in word choice and register.	Much evidence of strong writing skills. Lapses easily corrected. Often careful and effective use of vocabulary and register.	Articulate and fluid. Excellent and effective use of vocabulary and register. A pleasure to read.
Totals						