1. **Ideas and Analysis:** Makes a clear claim about the text. Supports argument with evidence from the text (quotations). If necessary, uses theoretical sources to help prove your claim.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Emerging  ↓ (1) | The ideas are barely recognizable; the paper says very little. |
| ↓ (2) | The content of the paper is largely superficial, but evident. |
| ↓(3) | The ideas go beyond superficial observations, locating a conflict or area of uncertainty, and reaching logical conclusions that show some insight. The paper asks but does not consistently answer “So what?” questions. |
| ↓(4)  Mastering | The paper carefully evolves its thesis to arrive at a qualified conclusion that clarifies or resolves a conflict, articulates and evaluates implications, or in some other way negotiates uncertainty to arrive at a revealing view of its subject. It asks and answers “So what?” questions resolutely. |

1. **Analysis of Evidence:** Close reads a moment or moments in the text as evidence for the claim. Uses evidence to ask and try to answer a “So What?” question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Emerging  ↓ (1) | The paper offers either overstated or clichéd ideas and very few pieces of evidence from the text, or a mass of evidence without controlling generalizations. Close reading ideas and quotations from the text don’t often match each other. |
| ↓ (2) | The match between close reading and evidence is appropriate, but the close reading is insufficiently qualified, and/or the details from the text are used only to confirm the reading (rather than qualify it). It often simply juxtaposes ideas and quotations. |
| ↓(3) | Concrete evidence not only support sound close readings but also are used to develop them. The paper explains how the evidence relates to the ideas, rather than assuming that the details can speak for themselves, but it may avoid rather than confront the “So What?” question. It often will not vary its focus much, regarding all of its evidence from the same distance. |
| ↓(4)  Mastering | The paper moves back and forth between ideas and evidence, using them to qualify and develop the thesis. It explores the most important details in depth, overtly substantiating their representativeness, and it consistently addresses evidence that complicates the thesis and evolves it answering the “So What?” question. |

1. **Organization and Coherence**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Emerging  ↓ (1) | The paper has little or no discernible sequence of thought; it wanders, repeats itself, and/or commits logical errors. |
| ↓ (2) | The paper has a discernible order, movement, and some feeling for a central idea and its parts. Its treatment is, however, so mechanical or list-like (for example, using 5-paragraph form) that the organization inhibits development of the ideas. |
| ↓(3) | The paper develops a strong central idea and appropriately subordinates secondary parts to its central focus, but tends to leave its discussions underdeveloped, often in the attempt to cover too much ground. The paragraphing is generally logical, but there are a few unduly bloated or skimpy paragraphs. |
| ↓(4)  Mastering | The paper rapidly focuses its thesis within an illuminating context, develops it in a way that is not excessively mechanical, and culminates by coming full circle. The paragraphing is coherent and smooth, but in most cases not simply linear: the discussion moves forward to implications but also backward to premises, and the writer periodically retraces and updates the evolution of the thesis for the reader. |

1. **Mechanics, Grammar, Punctuation, and Citation:** Is grammatically correct and coherently written. Properly uses in-text citation as well as includes a Works Cited page.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Emerging  ↓ (1) | The paper contains a variety of basic writing errors that interfere with coherence, does not use paragraphing to separate ideas, and includes a multitude of careless mistakes (such as misspellings). When quoting from texts, these citations are inaccurate or incomplete. |
| ↓ (2) | There are occasional writing errors (or repeated use of one or two) but not enough to threaten coherence. Citations are complete enough to locate quotations and sources. |
| ↓(3) | The paper is generally free of mechanical errors and grammatical irregularities; it may contain an error or two, and perhaps a few careless errors in punctuation or spelling. |
| ↓(4)  Mastering | The paper is free of errors, or nearly so. It makes use of a wide range of punctuation and handles complex grammatical constructions cleanly. Appropriate citation style is used correctly and consistently for both in-text citations as well as in the works cited. |

1. **Drafts, Peer Review, and Revision**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Emerging  ↓ (1) | Draft for peer review was not substantial enough for peers to review. Did not offer comments and revision suggestions for peers in group. |
| ↓ (2) | Offered only perfunctory remarks during peer review. May have had substantial draft during peer review, but did little to integrate comments from peers and professor during the revision process. |
| ↓(3) | Provided solid insight for peers during review. Integrated some comments into revision, but may still have done only minimal revisions, or focused only on grammar and punctuation (not higher order concerns). |
| ↓(4)  Mastering | Peer review comments and revisions address higher order concerns (cogency of thesis statement, development of argument, use of evidence, etc.). Student carefully considers peer and professor comments for revision and successfully integrates those comments into the final draft during revisions. |