

## Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

Assessment Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met?	•	+0/-3
Topic and Thesis Relevant and Appropriate?	•	+1/-1
Introduction and Conclusion Relevant and Appropriate?	•	+1/-1
Evidence Clear, Appropriate, and Sufficient?	•	+1/-1
Explanations Clear, Appropriate, and Sufficient?	•	+2/-1
Organization Clear and Appropriate?	•	+1/-1
Formatting Correct?	•	+0/-1
Mechanics Correct?	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed?	•	+1/+0
Total		
Overall Comments		

Clarification of assessment categories follows:

- Assigned Guidelines Met?—Does the paper, generally, present an argumentative literary critical essay? Does it provide 1,300 to 1,625 words of text, exclusive of headings, title, and any necessary end-citations?
- Topic and Thesis Relevant and Appropriate?—Does the paper indicate an appropriate topic, taken from the list indicated on the PProp? Is that topic sufficiently targeted to permit appropriate development in a paper of the prescribed scope? Is a targeted, argumentative thesis stated? Is it of a sort befitting upper-level undergraduate humanities work?
- Introduction and Conclusion Relevant and Appropriate?—Does the paper provide an introduction that contextualizes the argument to be made as it indicates topic and thesis? Does it offer a conclusion that moves beyond recapitulation into the idea of what future research can do with the thesis the paper should validate?
- Evidence Clear, Appropriate, and Sufficient?—Does the paper provide sufficient primary (and, likely, secondary and tertiary/critical evidence) to support the argument being made? Is the evidence appropriately attested in accordance with current Modern Language Association of America standards?
- Explanations Clear, Appropriate, and Sufficient?—Does the paper work through patterns of reasoning that suffice to validate the ways in which the evidence serves to support the stated thesis? Are those patterns of sorts likely to be accepted by an audience of interested scholars?

- **Organization Clear and Appropriate?**—Does the paper move through its points in an order that makes sense for the argument? Does it indicate the motion through clear and semantically appropriate transitional devices? Does it move smoothly within and between paragraphs?
- **Formatting Correct?**—Does the paper appear in double-spaced 12-point Garamond, Georgia, or Times New Roman typeface on letter-sized paper with one-inch margins? Are an appropriate title and heading provided? Are page numbers present, in their appropriate positions, and in the same typeface as the rest of the text? If they are needed, are in-text and end-of-text citations present and in accord with the current standards of the Modern Language Association of America?
- **Mechanics Correct?**—Does the paper adhere to the conventions of edited American English promulgated by the Modern Language Association of America and articulated in course materials? Does it evidence a level of diction and usage accordant with the expectation of oral delivery to an interested audience of scholars in the field?
- **Engagement Developed?**—As a sort of extra-credit item, does the paper avoid the use of trite and/or cliché phrasing? Does it offer some unusual perspective? Does it present materials in such a way as stand out favorably against common expectations for upper-division undergraduate humanities writing?