# Rubric Editorial Paper

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weak |  | Average |  | | Strong | |
| **Introductory Section**  (referred to as the editorial’s lede) | The lede in this editorial is not pulling in readers or hooking an audience. Does not encourage readers to continue. |  | Editorial written with a lede, but it needs to draw in readers more and have interesting aspects | |  | | Editorial written with an interesting lede that hooks readers |
| **Background Information** | No valid background information provided. |  | Contains little background information about the issue. | |  | | Contains sufficient background information about the issue |
| **Stance** | Stance is vague and confusing. |  | Stance is not fully developed. Stance might be clear but not throughout entire editorial or has contradictions. Doesn’t fully give closure to readers at the end. | |  | | Writer’s stance on issue clearly stated in the beginning. Writer addresses stance and gives closure at the end. |
| **Audience** | Not clear who the audience is supposed to be. Does not use formal English mechanics. |  | Confusing as to who is the appropriate audience and has some readability issues with grammatical mistakes. | |  | | Written to convince appropriate audience and shows effort to demonstrate knowledge of formal English language and mechanics. |
| **Evidence** | Editorial has little to no logical or relevant evidence. No commentary or reasoning is provided to readers. |  | Editorial has some evidence provided, but not all of it is logical or relevant. Does not fully support use of evidence with thorough reasoning and commentary. | |  | | Editorial provides logical evidence to support stance and includes reasoning for the support. |