

**Honors English 10**  
**Unit 1 Assessment 2 REPLACEMENT or BONUS**  
**“Musée des Beaux Arts” and “Landscape with the Fall of Icarus” comparison essay**

**RUBRIC**

**9-8 (95/90)**

Superior essays are convincing in their analysis of how the two poets depict human suffering, precise in their **textual evidence**, cogent in their definitions and use of **literary concepts**, and free of plot summary. These essays need not be without surface flaws, but they demonstrate the adept writer's ability to compare and contrast the **complex ideas** of both poems with insight and control of a wide range of the **elements of composition** (including organization, syntax, conventions, and integration of quotations). At all times, they make a compelling case for their interpretation and stay focused on the question and the **precisely-stated thesis**. These essays reflect **stylistic flair**, utilize **advanced vocabulary**, and provide in-depth and original analysis.

**7-6 (85/80)**

These effective essays offer a reasonable analysis of how the two poets depict human suffering as well as directly and accurately refer to the text(s) and literary concepts for support with minimal plot summary. They demonstrate the writer's ability to proficiently express complex ideas clearly, and they provide a sustained position and focus; however, they reveal a more limited understanding of complexity and concepts than do the papers in the 9-8 range. Generally, 6 essays present a less sophisticated analysis and less consistent command of the elements of effective writing than essays scored 7.

**5 (75)**

Offering a safe and plausible analysis of how the two poets depict human suffering, these competent essays make some reference to text(s) and literary concepts but include some plot summary and may not examine complexity effectively. Explanations may be mechanical or inadequately relate evidence to meaning, and the argument may be minimally supported and developed. They may be formulaic and are not as well conceived, organized, or developed as the upper papers. On the other hand, the writing is adequate to convey the writer's ideas and stays focused on the topic.

**4-3 (65/60)**

These papers offer an inadequate analysis of how the two poets depict human suffering as discussion is likely to be unpersuasive, unfocused, underdeveloped, or misguided. The meaning they deduce may be inaccurate or insubstantial and not clearly related to the topic or evidence. The presentation of ideas may be repetitive. The writing may convey the writer's ideas, but it reveals weaker control over such elements as diction, organization, syntax, or conventions. The 3 essays may contain **misinterpretations** of the topic or the work(s) they discuss; they may also contain little, if any, supporting evidence, and practice **paraphrase** and **plot summary** at the expense of analysis.

**2-1 (50/40)**

These essays compound the weakness of essays in the 4-3 range and are frequently unacceptably brief in their attempt to analyze how the two poets depict human suffering. They may persistently **misread**, and usually offer **little clarity, organization, or support**. They may be poorly written on several counts, including many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Although the writer may have made some effort to answer the question, the views presented have **little coherence**.