

# HL IB English 1 Rubric for On-Demand Writing & Supervised Writing Examinations

	<b>Distinguished 20 pts.</b>	<b>Proficient 17 pts.</b>	<b>Competent 15 pts.</b>	<b>Substandard 13 pts.</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations 10 pts.</b>
<b>Criterion A</b> <b>Knowledge and Understanding of the Text</b> <i>Extent to which the candidate knows the works studied, understands the question, and provides detailed and accurate references to the works</i>	Perceptive understanding of the works and subtleties of their meanings; provided detailed and persuasive references to the works	Good understanding of the works and some of the subtleties of their meanings; provided detailed and pertinent references to the text	Adequate understanding of the works; provided sufficient and appropriate references to the text	Superficial knowledge and familiarity with the works; inconsistently provided references to the text	Little knowledge and familiarity with the works; may have used one or more Part 2 works to answer question
<b>Criterion B</b> <b>Response to the Question</b> <i>Extent to which the candidate responded to specific demands of the question, supported claims, and expressed a relevant personal response</i>	Ideas are convincing and reveal independent thought; analysis is consistently developed with carefully selected examples	Ideas are thoughtfully explored and include a personal response; analysis is detailed with relevant examples	Ideas are pertinent to the question; analysis is adequate and supported with some relevant examples	Ideas are sometimes irrelevant and contain unsubstantiated generalizations; analysis reveals some awareness to the question	Ideas are insignificant and/or irrelevant; analysis is repetitious, paraphrased, or narrated with little awareness to the implications of the question
<b>Criterion C</b> <b>Appreciation of Literary Features</b> <i>Extent to which the candidate identified the impact of literary features, appreciated the effects of the literary features, and supported claims about the literary features with evidence from the works</i>	Pertinent and thorough appreciation for the effects of significant literary features; analysis is supported with highly relevant, comprehensive evidence from the works in relation to the question	Pertinent appreciation for the effects of literary features; analysis is supported with relevant evidence from the works in relation to the question	Adequate appreciation for the effects of literary features; supported, inconsistently, with relevant evidence from the works in relation to the question	Some consideration for literary features; supported with a superficial analysis from the works in relation to the question	Little, if any, mention of literary features from the works in relation to the question
<b>Criterion D</b> <b>Presentation</b> <i>Extent to which the candidate's commentary exhibits focus, structure, and coherent ideas</i>	Presentation is purposefully organized into a unique, persuasive argument; supporting examples are effectively integrated into an ordered and logical sequence; the body of the commentary with flawless application of transitional devices	Presentation is organized into a focused, developed argument; supporting examples are appropriately integrated into an ordered and logical sequence; transitional devices are accurately applied	Presentation is generally focused and developed; supporting examples are presented in an ordered and logical sequence into the body of the commentary but may lack internal consistency	Presentation has a sense of focus and development; supporting examples are unsuccessfully presented in an ordered and logical sequence	Presentation lacks a clear organizational structure with little attempt to present ideas in an ordered and logical sequence
<b>Criterion E</b> <b>Formal Use of Language</b> <i>Extent to which the candidate uses expressive, accurate, clear, and precise language, applies conventional spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage, as well as conveys an overall impression and unique style</i>	Language is stylistically unique, impressionable, challenging, varied, precise, concise, and engaging; no significant errors with spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, or usage; language effectively suits a discussion about literature	Language is clear, varied, and precise; no significant errors with spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, or usage; language appropriately suits a discussion about literature	Language is generally clear and coherent; minor errors with spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and/or usage; language generally supports a discussion about literature	Language is sometimes clear and coherent; frequent errors with spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and/or usage; language inconsistently supports a discussion about literature	Language is unclear and incoherent; significant and frequent errors with spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization, grammar, and usage; language is inappropriate for a discussion about literature