*Academic Writing Scoring Criteria: Final Paper ~ Interpretation of Literature*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Criteria* | *Emerging* |  | *Developing* |  | *Mastering* |
| *Focus*  *(35%)* | Does not meet assignment requirements in one or more of the following ways: fails to meet minimum length requirement, does not address all three questions on the assignment prompt.  Essay lacks a clear thesis statement or does not make an argument that extends beyond plot summary. |  | Partially meets assignment requirements.  Ideas are partially developed, perhaps sometimes veer off point. Essay does not typically develop, expand upon, or complicate ideas to make the argument more complex. |  | Meets assignment requirements  Insightful/intriguing claims; ideas are convincing and compelling; argument builds throughout the paper without deviating from the central claims; cogent analysis of text(s). |
| *Evidence*  *(20%)* | Paper lacks evidence to support overarching argument. *Remember that outside evidence provided without proper citation is consider plagiarism and will cause the entire assignment to receive a* ***zero****.* |  | Fair selection of supporting details for claims made about the text(s). Some Some quotes and paraphrases are not introduced and/or analyzed and may not be linked to the overarching argument |  | Cogent synthesis of evidence relevant to larger claims. Quotations are introduced, integrated, analyzed, and cited appropriately. |
| *Organization*  *(20%)* | Paper lacks any clear organizational structure. Essay material is not organized logically into paragraphs that each have one main point. An introduction and a conclusion are entirely lacking from the paper. |  | Inconsistent use of topic sentences, segues, and transitions. Paragraph organization is sometimes illogical. Cliché or too broad of an introduction; conclusion doesn’t introduce anything new/synthesize earlier claims but merely restates points made elsewhere.  Supporting points follow a somewhat logical progression; occasional wandering of ideas; some interruption of cohesiveness. |  | Engaging introduction, relevant topic sentences, good segues, appropriate transitions, and compelling conclusion.  Logical progression of supporting points; very cohesive. |
| *Style*  *(20%)* | Frequent grammar/punctuation errors; inconsistent point of view.  Significant problems with syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary. |  | Some grammar/punctuation errors occur in some places; somewhat consistent point of view.  Occasional problems with syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary. |  | Correct grammar and punctuation; consistent point of view.  Rhetorically-sound syntax, diction, word choice, and vocabulary. |
| *Format*  *(5%)* | Little compliance with accepted documentation (MLA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, and works cited page. |  | Inconsistent compliance with accepted documentation (MLA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, and works cited page. |  | Consistent compliance with accepted documentation (MLA) for paper formatting, in-text citations, and works cited page. |