

	5	4	3	2	1
Categories and Score Meaning	Outstanding! (Advanced)	Wow! (Proficient)	So-So (Basic)	Needs Improvement (Struggling)	Oops (Below Basic)
Content: thematic analysis of literature	Author makes connections between textual support and overall main idea/ theme and figurative language. Moves beyond WHAT happens and analyzes the WHY. Author has expressed unique insight, depth of thought, resulting in convincing and enlightening responses	Author makes connections between textual support and figurative language, though some may be more stilted. The WHY is discussed, but in a more pedestrian manner, leading to more obvious conclusions or showing less depth of thought overall, yet responses are still sound and interesting.	Author waivers in connection between textual support and ideas. Some ideas are unoriginal or only skim the surface of the novels' content. The thematic ideas may not be incorporated throughout the responses well, resulting in a weaker dialectical journal.	Author has little connection between textual support and ideas, or does not explore the WHY, simply identifies elements to outline the plot of the novel. Journal may be unoriginal in thought, leading to a regurgitation of obvious facts and observations.	Author has failed to focus on the text. The responses lack depth and does not interpret text, simply revisits and summarizes.
Style: organization, clarity and fluency of ideas, focus on main ideas	Overall fluent and focused responses. Responses are framed with connections to overall main idea/ theme and figurative language and are organized by ideas. Incorporates textual support in a sophisticated manner.	Journal is mostly focused and fluent. Ideas contain connections though perhaps not as explicitly at times. Textual support is evident but may not be as strong.	Journal focus waivers or fluency is interrupted at times. Ideas are organized but not in the most logical way. May contain more implicit than explicit connections to the main idea/theme/ figurative language. May contain more "fluff" than substance.	Journal is organized in an illogical manner, and the connections between ideas may be vague. Implicit connections to the main idea throughout.	Journal lacks any fluency or organization of ideas. Focus waivers drastically. The main ideas get lost along the way. Lacks explicit connections between ideas.
Conventions: Grammar, spelling, subject/verb agreement, punctuation, usage (limited "to be" verbs)	Journal uses 3rd person, active voice, present tense, with strong verbs and a variety of sentence structures. Has clearly been proofread, as errors are sparse and language is, in turn, sophisticated and formal. All in-text citations are correctly written and Works Cited page is present with no errors.	Journal contains occasional flaws in grammar and conventions, perhaps with more repetitive sentence structures or more common language. May have missed some of the more difficult language errors. Most of the in-text citations are correctly written and a Works Cited page is present with little to no errors.	Journal contains obvious errors in grammar and conventions throughout, although they do not distract from the meaning. Language usage is sentence structure is basic but still conveys the point. In-text citations are present but may not be correct. Works Cited page is present with some errors.	Journal is peppered with errors in grammar and conventions and frequently must be re-read to follow the ideas. Language and structure begin to distract from the meaning, lacking the maturity of the better essays. Most in-text citations are present with some errors Works Cited page is present with many errors.	It seems as though the Journal was not proofread at all. Various errors in usage, grammar, and conventions distract greatly from the ideas and mar the essay to the point of incoherence. In-text citations are not present or contain many errors. Works Cited pages is present with many errors or not present at all.