

## Rubric for C1 Undergraduate Academic Essay

Criterion	5: Excellence (C1+)	4: Proficient (C1)	3: Competent (B2/C1)	2: Developing (B2)	1: Insufficient (B1)
1. <b>Argumentation &amp; Communicative Purpose</b> (points x5)	Thesis is sophisticated, nuanced, and insightful, driving the entire essay. The <b>communicative purpose</b> (e.g., to persuade, to analyze) is achieved with exceptional clarity and force.	Presents a clear, arguable, and well-defined thesis in the introduction. The essay consistently adheres to its central <b>communicative purpose</b> ; the argument is strong and well-supported.	Thesis is present and arguable, but may be simplistic or overly broad. The essay's purpose is clear, but the argument may occasionally drift or lack full development.	Thesis is vague, descriptive, or poorly formulated. The <b>communicative purpose</b> is unclear or inconsistent, and the argument is weak.	No clear thesis or identifiable argument. The text fails to meet the basic requirements of an academic essay.
2. <b>Structure &amp; Logical Flow</b> (points x2)	Demonstrates a masterful command of essay structure (Intro-Body-Conclusion)	Adheres to a clear and effective academic structure. The <b>logical flow</b> is evident;	Structure is conventional and functional, but may be formulaic. <b>Logical flow</b> is	Structural components (e.g., introduction, conclusion) are weak, missing, or	Lacks a coherent structure. The text is disjointed, and the progression of ideas is

	n). The <b>logical flow</b> is seamless, with ideas progressing in a compelling and sophisticated sequence.	paragraphs are well-sequenced, and the reader can follow the progression of ideas with ease.	generally clear, but some transitions may be abrupt or mechanical. Paragraphing is mostly appropriate.	poorly organized. The <b>logical flow</b> is difficult to follow, and paragraphing is illogical.	confusing or random.
<b>3. Cohesion &amp; Coherence (points x3)</b>	Achieves exceptional <b>textuality</b> . Uses a wide, sophisticated range of cohesive devices (e.g., substitution, ellipsis, advanced linkers, lexical chains) to create a unified and elegant text.	Demonstrates strong <b>coherence</b> and <b>cohesion</b> . Uses C1-level referencing (pronouns, determiners) and linking devices effectively to connect ideas within and between paragraphs.	The text is generally <b>coherent</b> . Relies on a more limited or repetitive range of cohesive devices (e.g., <i>furthermore</i> , <i>in addition</i> , <i>however</i> ), but meaning is clear.	<b>Cohesion</b> is weak. Over-relies on basic conjunctions (e.g., <i>and</i> , <i>but</i> , <i>so</i> ) or repetition, resulting in a text that is choppy or difficult to read.	The text is fundamentally incoherent. Ideas are not connected, and the text reads as a list of disparate sentences.
<b>4. Linguistic Competence</b>	Language <b>style</b> is clear and meaningful. Demonstrates mastery of C1-level	Consistently maintains a formal academic <b>style</b> and objective tone. Uses	Generally maintains a formal <b>style</b> , but may have occasional lapses into	<b>Style</b> is inconsistent and often inappropriate for an academic context.	Language is informal, personal, and unsuitable for academic

	vocabulary and complex grammatical structures with virtually no errors.	a wide range of C1-level vocabulary and sentence structures (e.g., inversion, clefts, participles) accurately.	informal language or subjective tone. C1 linguistic features are attempted, but with some errors.	Vocabulary is general (B2 level), and grammatical errors are noticeable and may impede clarity.	work. Basic grammatical and lexical errors are frequent and obscure meaning.
<b>5. Use of Evidence &amp; Academic Integrity</b>	Evidence is skillfully selected, synthesized, and integrated to build a novel argument. Citations and referencing (e.g., APA, MLA) are flawless.	Evidence is relevant, sufficient, and correctly integrated (paraphrased, summarized, or quoted) to support topic sentences. All sources are cited correctly with a corresponding reference list.	Evidence is present and relevant, but may be "dropped in" without sufficient analysis or integration. Citations and referencing are attempted but contain formatting errors or inconsistencies.	Evidence is weak, absent, or poorly chosen (e.g., non-academic sources). Citations are missing or fundamentally incorrect.	No evidence is provided, or the text shows clear signs of plagiarism.