

	Excellent 10	Very Good 8-9	Fair 6-7	Poor 4-5	Unacceptable
Analysis	The paper organizes its support of the thesis around analytical units.	The paper makes analytical use of evidence from to support its thesis	The paper shows evidence of analysis but these are not well integrated into an argument	The paper breaks up the data into segments (site components, separate interviews, etc) but does not analyze them.	The paper mostly describes the site, interviews, or texts
Interpretation	Paper offers a clear account of media reception that follows logically from the analysis	Paper offers an account of media reception that mostly follows logically from the analysis	Paper offers an account of media reception whose connection with the analysis is not entirely clear	Paper offers an account of media reception that is not consistent with the analysis	Paper is essentially descriptive; does not interpret the media reception.
Thesis	Clear, focused and well articulated thesis statement that will drive a deep analysis	Clear thesis describing a meaning or function of the text that can be argued pro or con from evidence	Adequate but general or ambiguous thesis statement; hard to fully support or contradict from evidence	Thesis is a topical statement, not a thesis; does not support an argument	Lacks any thesis or statement of what the paper is intended to argue
Argument	Strongly supports thesis with evidence; strongly addresses counterarguments	Strongly supports thesis with evidence; considers counterarguments	Adequately supports thesis with evidence	Inadequate evidence to support claim	Lacks a thesis or claim to support; OR evidence offered does not support claim
Introduction	Interesting introduction that contextualizes the thesis into a larger social or analytical problem	Clear and interesting introduction that adequately contextualizes the thesis	Adequate but general contextualization of thesis	Unclear or unfocused contextualization of thesis statement	No contextualization of thesis
Transitions	Smooth, logical, clear, elegant flow of ideas from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph	Logical and clear flow of ideas from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph	Inconsistent flow of ideas from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph	Awkward flow of ideas from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph	No visible attempt to tie ideas together.
Conclusion	Logical and interesting recapitulation of problem and arguments. Suggests ways argument could contribute to other conversations.	Clear recapitulation of problem and arguments. Draws interesting implications from argument.	Adequate but sometimes unclear or excessive recapitulation of problem and arguments. Draws reasonable implications from argument.	Incomplete, excessive or murky recapitulation of problem and arguments. Draws simplistic implications from argument.	Does not recapitulate problem and arguments. Draws no implications from argument.
Critical Thinking	Multiple perspectives acknowledged and integrated into argument	Multiple perspectives acknowledged and accounted for.	Describes multiple interpretations of text but fails to offer criteria for choosing between them.	Seeks only to marshal evidence in support of thesis; alternatives not discussed	Seems to assume no other interpretation of text or evidence is possible
Writing	Clear and compelling writing. Engages the reader.	Clear, straightforward writing, easy to read and understand	Mostly clear writing; occasionally confusing or difficult to understand.	Often confusing or ambiguous so that it gets in the way of understanding the argument	Difficult or impossible to follow argument because of style.
Mechanics	No errors	1-2 errors/page	3-4 errors/page	Errors confuse meaning	Unreadable