

GRADE		A (=Excellent)	B (=good)	C (=satisfactory)	D (=poor)
CONTENT	<i>Alignment with Assignment</i>	Paper explicitly addresses, and engages with, all components of assignment and demonstrates full command of key phrases and concepts.	Addresses main assignment questions/components in detail.	Follows most assignment questions/components, but lacking depth.	No evident relationship with the assignment.
	<i>Quality of Analysis</i>	Clear and concise analysis that remains strong throughout the paper, characterized by range and depth of argument. Examines topic from a wide range of vantage points and considers multiple, relevant perspectives. Uses highly original ideas and approach. Identifies underlying assumptions on which argument is based. Acknowledges contradictions and ambiguities.	Thorough analysis that remains strong through most of the paper. Examines topic from several vantage points. Introduces original ideas but does not complicate material or fully acknowledge its ambiguities.	Adequate analysis that specifies the problem but loses its strength occasionally. Examines topic from a valid yet limited perspective. Largely lacks original ideas.	Insufficient analysis. Does not identify relevant issues or represents them inaccurately.
	<i>Supporting Evidence/ Quotes</i>	Seamlessly integrates relevant course materials. Uses excellent examples from a variety of contexts that support thesis. Only quotes sentences and phrases that are immediately relevant to the argument. Free from long stretches of quotations that remain unanalyzed. Handles evidence critically, being mindful to the source. Distinguishes between fact and opinion.	Integrates relevant course materials. Examples are well chosen and support thesis. Some quotations remain not fully analyzed or don't advance the argument.	Integrates some course materials. Sufficient use of evidence that mostly illustrate arguments, though its relevance is not always made clear. Uses at times generalizations to support arguments. Doesn't always differentiate between fact and opinion.	Weak examples that do not support thesis, or missing altogether.
	<i>Analytical vs. descriptive</i>	Multifaceted, in-depth analysis that explores <i>how</i> and <i>why</i> a text works rather than summarizing it (=providing a synopsis of <i>what</i> it says). Narrative kept to minimum needed for analysis.	Good analysis, few narrative or descriptive parts.	Too much narrative or description instead of analysis.	Largely descriptive, only partial, insufficient analysis of material. Merely repeats/retells information provided in materials.
	<i>Appropriate integration of specific course and assignment terminology</i>	Uses course and assignment vocabulary precisely and effectively. Demonstrates thorough understanding of ideas presented in class and in the readings.	Uses some of the course/assignment vocabulary. Demonstrates substantial understanding of ideas presented in class and in the readings.	Adequate use of course and assignment vocabulary. Demonstrates sufficient understanding of ideas presented in class and in the readings.	No, inappropriate, or misuse of course/assignment terminology. Does not demonstrate clear

					understanding of material.
STRUCTURE/ ORGANIZATION	<i>Introduction</i>	Provides reader with contextual framework for paper and a concise overview of topic; clearly identifies the main question/problem at stake and acknowledges the complexity of the topic.	Identifies key assumptions and prepares the reader for analysis.	Adequately introduces reader to main topic, introduces the basics but lacks to identify nuances.	Collection of undeveloped, unconnected thoughts.
	<i>Thesis statement</i>	Strong and persuasive thesis (main point) that answers directly the assignment question, demonstrates complexity, and sets the stage for a compelling analysis.	Good thesis that is mostly supported by arguments; might lack clear focus and sophistication. Paper/analysis largely supports thesis.	Thesis is adequate though limited and not fully developed; vague/too general and incompletely supported. At times, paper loses sight of thesis and fails to support it.	No or unclear thesis statement.
	<i>Coherence</i>	Smooth flow of arguments created by transitions between ideas within and between paragraphs; echoing key phrases relevant to the topic. Logical arrangement of ideas, easy to follow.	Ties ideas together in a coherent manner. Ideas presented in an organized manner.	Inconsistent, at times incoherent, connection between ideas.	Due to the lack of organization of thoughts and ideas, the paper is hard to follow. Abrupt or no transitions.
	<i>Topic sentences</i>	Every paragraph contains a clear, polished topic sentence.	Mostly uses effective topic sentences.	Largely weak, descriptive topic sentences.	Few, or no, effective topic sentences.
	<i>Conclusion</i>	Draws conclusions instead of using the last paragraph as a stopping place. Reflects on both significance of topic and significance of presented arguments and discusses their implications.	Identifies conclusions, points out some implications and consequences of arguments.	Conclusion mostly “lists” arguments but fails to point out significance of results. Concluding statements are too vague and general.	Conclusion is missing, or unrelated o the analysis.
CLARITY AND STYLE	- style sheet - contractions (<i>isn't, she's, can't</i>) - colloquialisms and slang - word choice and sentence structure	Paper follows the writing suggestions/style sheet posted on blackboard. Communicates ideas succinctly in graceful prose without being wordy; no contractions and no colloquialisms and slang expressions. Integrates varied word choice and sentence structure.	Paper largely follows the writing suggestions/style sheet posted on blackboard. Communicates ideas clearly; at times wordy; uses contractions and some colloquialisms and slang expressions. Uses some variety in word choice and sentence structure.	Paper partially follows the writing suggestions/style sheet posted on blackboard. Communicates ideas adequately; often too wordy; uses contractions; frequent use of colloquialisms and slang expressions. At times unclear meaning, awkward wording.	Paper neglects the writing suggestions/style sheet posted on blackboard. Does not communicate ideas clearly; too wordy. Pervasive use of

					contractions, colloquialisms and slang expressions. Poor word and sentence structure; largely repetitive.
	<i>Writing Voice</i>	Uses a formal yet creative writing voice that avoids both first-person pronouns (I, we, us) and addressing the reader using second-person pronouns (you, your).	Largely uses an appropriate, formal writing voice that avoids first-person pronouns (we, us) and rarely addresses the reader using second-person pronouns (you, your)	Mostly uses an informal writing voice (repetitive use of I, we, us) and frequently addresses the reader using second-person pronouns (you, your).	Uses an informal writing voice (I, we, us) and addresses the reader using second-person pronouns (you, your) throughout the paper.
	<i>Tense</i>	Uses present tense when writing about literature, films, etc., and secondary texts. Uses past tense only when referring to historical events that took place in the past.	Inconsistent use of proper tense; switches between tenses.	Largely inconsistent use of tense.	Uses past tense throughout paper.
	<i>Syntax</i>	Writes in well-crafted, complete sentences (= sentence contains a subject and a predicate); free from sentence fragments and run-on sentences.	Mostly writes in complete sentences; occasional sentence fragments and/or run-on sentences.	Numerous sentence fragments and/or run-on sentences.	Pervasive use of sentence fragments and/or run-on sentences.
	<i>Grammar/Spelling/Punctuation/Proofreading</i>	Free of major errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	Few minor and major errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. More careful proofreading recommended.	Frequent minor and major errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Needs more thorough proofreading.	Amount of errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation distract reader from focusing on content/ideas, resulting in incoherence. No apparent proofreading.
MECHANICS	<i>Documentation of sources</i>	Includes consistent and proper bibliography/Works Cited Page and citations (in-text or footnotes).	Includes consistent and proper bibliography/Works Cited Page and citations (in-text or footnotes).	Mostly uses consistent and proper bibliography/Works Cited Page and citations (in-text or footnotes).	Inconsistent and improper bibliography/Works Cited Page and citations (in-text or footnotes).
	<i>Format</i>	Sticks to paper length and other format requirements (font, page numbers, margins)	Sticks to paper length and other format requirements.	Partially sticks to paper length and other format requirements.	Does not stick to paper length and other format requirements.