|  | |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** |
| Intelligibility  Is the explanation of the material clear? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  Meaning is effectively communicated throughout. Sentences are varied and there is no repetitious of ideas in a paragraph. Each sentence of the paper has a specific purpose to develop the idea meaningfully. | **Satisfactory**  Significant grammar or syntax errors that impede meaning in isolated cases. More frequent wordiness; unclear or awkward sentences; imprecise use of words | **Unsatisfactory**  Systematic grammar or syntax errors impede meaning such that argument is not intelligible. Numerous grammatical errors and stylistic problems seriously detract from the argument. | |
| Clear Thesis  Is a short, precise statement of the main idea present in the introduction? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  Thesis is specific, relevant, thoughtful, and arguable relevant to the central ideas of the essay. | **Satisfactory**  Thesis vague or not central to argument; central terms not defined. There is a thesis statement, but it’s not clear. | **Unsatisfactory**  No simple thesis statement found. Thesis statement does not successfully engage the prompt or themes. | |
| Textual Support  Is the relevant material from the reading supported with good examples? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  Most concepts, when introduced, are followed by an example.  Shows a good understanding of the texts, ideas and methods of the assignment. | **Satisfactory**  There are examples, but it is not clear how they relate or explain the concept. There may be significant inaccuracy. Shows an understanding of the basic ideas and information involved in the assignment; may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors. | **Unsatisfactory**  No examples are provided to further develop ideas. AND/OR Irrelevant quotes or misinterpretations throughout. Writer lacks critical understanding of lectures, readings, discussions, or assignments. | |
| Argumentative Structure  How does the paper present the ideas? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  Paper presents arguments ordered in a clear way. The inferences being made are explained and not just reported. Distinct units of thought in paragraphs controlled by specific, detailed, and arguable topic sentences; clear transitions between developed, cohering, and logically arranged paragraphs. | **Satisfactory**  There is an argumentative structure, but at times it is not clear. The author fails to explain some important inferences being made. Paragraphs may contains extraneous information. | **Unsatisfactory**  Paper does not follow clear argumentative structure. Frequent repetition. Relevant inferences are not present or left unexplained. Paragraphs are simplistic, wanders from one topic to another; illogical arrangement of ideas | |
| Mapping  Is there a map of the whole paper at the beginning? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  The author explains how the paper will develop from one paragraph to the next. This is clearly laid out in the introduction. | **Satisfactory**  The author somewhat indicates how the paper will develop from one paragraph to the next. But it is not clearly laid out or may not occur in the introduction. | **Unsatisfactory**  The author does not explain how the paper will develop from one paragraph to the next in the introduction or anyway in the body of the essay. | |
| Counter-arguments  Does the author present problems with the arguments? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  Substantial counter-arguments, counter-examples, or counter-views are considered for all important controversial premises. | **Satisfactory**  At least one counter-argument is considered, but key controversial premises remain unexamined. | **Unsatisfactory**  There are no counter-arguments considered. The paper just sticks to one position and does not even consider the other side. | |
| Analysis  How does the paper analyze the various arguments? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  The paper successfully breaks the problem, concepts, and arguments into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are clear and accurate. | **Satisfactory**  The paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections between the parts are somewhat accurate. | **Unsatisfactory**  The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are inaccurate. | |
| Synthesis  How does the paper draw connections from multiple texts and synthesize the various ideas into a coherent whole? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. The connections between the parts are clear and insightful. | **Satisfactory**  The paper integrates some parts from various places into a somewhat coherent whole. The connections between the parts are somewhat unclear. | **Unsatisfactory**  The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear. | |
| Textual Accuracy  Is the relevant material from the reading presented accurately? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Proficient**  All ideas that come from the texts are cited appropriately, including the work cited page and in-text citations. Quoting is minimal, but when used is quite effective. All paraphrases are accurately cited. | **Satisfactory**  Some lapses in proper citation, including lacking one or more required references (e.g., page numbers or mistakes in works cited page), but there is a clear attempt at citing sources | **Unsatisfactory**  No citations or references to the text. There may be a work cited page or not, and there is no references made in the text indicating where certain ideas were derived. | |