

Grading Guidelines Professor Martínez

18-20 points

A paper *excellent* in over-all quality

- 1.) has a clearly stated thesis or aim of exceptional interest or acuity
- 2.) is well-organized to present that thesis or aim.
- 3.) shows that the student has read carefully and developed original and full responses to the readings.
- 4.) uses a rich and appropriate vocabulary, without being wordy.
- 5.) uses examples and evidence persuasively in support of analysis.
- 6.) employs a variety of appropriate sentence structures.
- 7.) has no mechanical errors.
- 8.) is written in a clear, natural voice appropriate to the assignment.
- 9.) has appropriately and completely documented use of sources using Chicago-style footnotes.

16-18 points

A paper *good or very good* in over-all quality

- 1.) has a clearly stated thesis or aim.
- 2.) is adequately organized to present that thesis or aim.
- 3.) shows that the student has read carefully, although responses may be inconsistently developed and may not be original.
- 4.) uses a vocabulary which is appropriate but limited in range.
- 5.) uses examples and evidence competently to support analysis.
- 6.) has some variety in sentence structure.
- 7.) has few mechanical errors, and these do not interfere with comprehension.
- 8.) has an authorial voice appropriate to the assignment.
- 9.) has documented use of sources using Chicago-style footnotes, with minor errors.

14-16 points

A paper *fair* in over-all quality

- 1.) includes a statement of thesis or aim.
- 2.) is for the most part logically organized.
- 3.) shows that the student has done the reading. Comprehension may be faulty and/or arguments undeveloped.
- 4.) has a narrow or inexact vocabulary that does interfere with comprehension.
- 5.) uses examples and evidence but these do not support analysis persuasively.
- 6.) lacks variety in sentence structure, though sentences are mostly syntactically correct.
- 7.) has several mechanical errors, but these do not interfere with comprehension.
- 8.) has an uneven authorial voice: sometimes appropriate, but elsewhere colloquial, stilted, awkwardly abstract, or oratorical.
- 9.) has incompletely or inconsistently documented sources using Chicago-style footnotes.

12-14 points

An unacceptable paper

- 1.) attempts unsuccessfully to state a thesis or aim.
- 2.) is poorly, even illogically organized.
- 3.) shows that the student has read only superficially, or perhaps not at all.
- 4.) has an inexact vocabulary that interferes with comprehension.
- 5.) uses few or poor examples and evidence, or uses them in a confused way.
- 6.) has basic errors in sentence structure, such as subject/verb agreement and fragments.
- 7.) has mechanical errors such as punctuation that interfere with comprehension.
- 8.) has an authorial voice that interferes with the presentation of material.
- 9.) has not demonstrated the appropriate documentation of sources using Chicago-style footnotes.

0-12 points

A failing paper

- 1.) fails to state a thesis or aim.
- 2.) has no discernable organization.
- 3.) does not reflect on, or reflect accurately the reading.
- 4.) has an inexact vocabulary that interferes with comprehension.
- 5.) uses no examples or evidence, or uses them in a confused way.
- 6.) has basic errors in sentence structure, such as subject/verb agreement and fragments.
- 7.) has mechanical errors such as punctuation that interfere with comprehension.
- 8.) has an authorial voice that interferes with the presentation of material.
- 9.) Has failed to document sources appropriately using Chicago-style footnotes.