

**Writer's Name** \_\_\_\_\_**HCTC Grader's Initials** \_\_\_\_\_

You have been asked to explain basic Statics concepts to a general audience by examining a structural failure. Strong writers will also effectively engage the topic from an ethical perspective — and use clear and concise language to enlighten readers about the complexities, risks, and responsibilities of engineering.

**First Draft Comments:****Final Paper Comments:**

--	--

**Grading**—Out of **100 points**, you can earn a maximum of **85 points** for your final writing score, **10 points** for submitting a complete first draft on time to ICON, and **5 points** for your HCTC visit.

<b>Introduction/Clarification of Purpose</b>	<b>First Draft</b>	<b>Final Draft</b>
Introduction is complete and compelling; argument is clearly stated and defined within the opening paragraphs.		
Introduction lacks depth; argument is stated but could be better defined.		
Introduction contains insufficient or irrelevant material; argument is poorly defined.		
Introduction is vague or confusing; no argument is present.		

### **Audience**

Discussion is concise, detailed, and can be clearly understood by a general audience.		
Discussion could be more detailed and precise. Concepts are adequately expressed but at times hampered by a lack of clarity.		
Discussion lacks sufficient detail and ideas are not effectively communicated for a general audience.		
Discussion lost in verbal fog; explanations too vague to be understood.		

### **Statics Concepts**

Relevant Statics concepts are explained with clarity and depth.		
Relevant Statics concepts are stated but are confusing or unclear at times.		
Relevant Statics concepts are not effectively explained.		
Relevant Statics concepts are not explained.		

### **Ethical Analysis**

Analysis of the role ethical lapses played in the failure is persuasive, well-researched, and sheds light on the responsibilities of engineering.		
Analysis of ethical lapses is plausible and well-written, but either lacks depth or fails to provide a broader perspective.		
Analysis of ethics is unclear, shallow, or tacked on at the end of the essay.		
Analysis of ethics is missing or badly executed.		

### **Organization/Paragraphs**

Ideas are presented logically and are well organized. Smooth transitions are evident from idea to idea and paragraph to paragraph.		
Ideas and paragraphs are competently written but could be clearer. Transitions are evident but could be better developed.		
Ideas and paragraphs are unclear and/or underdeveloped; weak transitions hamper organization.		
Ideas and paragraphs are disorganized. No or few appropriate transitions.		

<b>Sentence Structure/Tone</b>	<b>First Draft</b>	<b>Final Draft</b>
Sentences are complex and well-structured; sophisticated and professional tone is geared to a college-level audience.		
Sentences are generally structured well but could be more complex; tone attempts professionalism but is inconsistent at times.		
Sentence structure and tone are too simplistic.		
Sentence fragments and unprofessional tone present throughout the article.		

**Figure**

Figure is clearly labeled, specific to the failure, and effectively analyzed.		
Figure is useful, but either not properly captioned or not fully discussed.		
Figure lacks relevance and/or is not discussed.		
Figure is missing.		

**Usage**

Grammar and spelling are error-free.		
Grammar and spelling have minor errors.		
Grammar and/or spelling have persistent problems.		

**Conclusion**

Conclusion builds on previous discussion to make a specific and insightful argument about the responsibilities of engineering.		
Conclusion is adequate but could be more detailed and/or persuasive.		
Conclusion lacks sufficient detail and its persuasive power is weak.		
Conclusion is vague and no convincing argument is evident.		

**Citations**

In-text citations and References page follow proper APA formatting.		
APA documentation is evident but needs some correction.		
APA formatting has major errors.		
No appropriate APA documentation is present.		

**GRADING**

<b>Final Draft (0 to 85 points)</b>	
<b>HCTC Visit (5 points)</b> To receive these points, you must schedule and successfully complete your 25-minute appointment between Sept. 26 (Tues) – Oct. 18 (Wed) or Nov. 1 (Wed) - Nov. 28 (Tues).	
<b>First Draft (up to 10 points)</b> To receive these points, your draft must be complete (1000-1250 words with all required elements) and on time.	
<b>Final Grade (0 to 100 points)</b>	