

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

General Guidelines	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Has a compelling hook •Remains brief while narrowing logically to thesis •Introduces both works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hook is clichéd or uninteresting but present •Paragraph eventually narrows to thesis •Paragraph is too long but does introduce both works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No hook; paragraph narrows illogically •Thesis is present but buried within the introductory paragraph •Paragraph is too short and/or doesn't introduce both works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Introduction is not present or incomplete •Does not contain a thesis statement • Narrows illogically; intro veers off topic •Doesn't introduce the works
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized in a logical fashion; each paragraph ties to the next •Points within paragraphs are organized • Texts and sources are seamlessly integrated • Paper ends strongly and drives the argument home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay is mostly well organized with only a few stray points • Texts and sources are, for the most part, seamlessly integrated • Paper ends with strong, compelling points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some argumentative points within paragraphs lack order •One or more paragraphs are out of logical order in the overall structure of the essay • The information, sources, and texts are covered in largely separate paragraphs that lack flow; ideas are separate and do not integrate with each other •Organizational structure weakens the overall argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Essay reads like separate papers on different texts; there is little to no connection established between the works/concepts •Most points within paragraphs are out of logical order • Essay needs substantial restructuring •Organization undermines the overall argument
Flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses transitions effectively between points and within paragraphs •Paper reads like one coherent piece; cannot tell which parts come from web articles and which do not •Paper is very easy to read; each point moves easily into the next 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses transitions effectively between paragraphs; a few minor flow issues within paragraphs •Paper is easy to read, most points transition smoothly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some sentences are choppy and disconnected • Uses paragraph transitions but lacks flow within paragraphs • Lack of flow affects essay's readability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of flow makes essay nearly unreadable • Most sentences are choppy and disconnected •Little flow within paragraphs •Lacks transitions between paragraphs
Balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spends equal time analyzing each work • Strikes balance between evidence and commentary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly balances analysis • Mostly balances evidence and commentary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly addresses one work more than the others, which weakens the argument •Makes few direct comparisons • Lacks balance between evidence and commentary in parts of the essay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay deals with second text as an afterthought; does not make direct comparisons between works • Balance between evidence and commentary swings wildly in favor of one or the other

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

General Guidelines	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
Outside Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Writer uses correct amount and types of source •Sources are substantially used in the paper •All sources are integrated well and represented correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Writer uses correct amount and type of sources •Most sources are substantially used •Most sources are integrated well, though all are represented correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Writer uses the correct amount of sources, but they do not fit requirements •Sources are used, but briefly and sporadically; sources used in inappropriate places •Source integration creates flow issues; generally poor integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not enough sources used; sources don't fit parameters •Sources are rarely used throughout paper or used incorrectly •Misrepresentation of sources •Very little flow with source integration; very poorly done
Parenthetical Citations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All paraphrases and quotations are perfectly cited in MLA format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one or two pieces of evidence lack citation • Citations are in MLA format with no errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some paraphrases and quotations lack citation • Citations have formatting errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Most quotations lack citation •Paraphrases aren't cited •Citations are incorrect or not in MLA format
Work Cited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present and perfectly formatted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present with only one or two minor errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present with one or more major errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not present • Not in MLA format • Missing cited works
Grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay is almost perfect • Language fits a formal essay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper contains a few grammatical errors, none of which detract from meaning or hamper readability • Language is solid; some colloquialisms, but mostly formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper contains many grammar errors that affect the argument's clarity •Errors sometimes impact paper's readability • Language is sometimes informal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay is rife with errors that detract from the essay's argument and clarity • Errors render the essay nearly unreadable •Uses informal language; does not update web articles' tone
Reading Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay demonstrates writer's close and careful analysis of the text • Shows an excellent comprehension of source works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay demonstrates a correct reading and analysis of the texts •Shows a solid comprehension of source works with no misunderstandings of the original texts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay contains a few notable misunderstandings of the source works, which results in some shaky textual analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Essay contains major misreadings of the source works •These misreadings contribute to faulty analyses
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succinctly sums up argument without restating every point • Pushes the argument one step further; keeps the reader thinking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sums up argument without restating every point; a bit longer than necessary • Ending thoughts are clichéd but pertinent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion sums up argument point by point • Writing is formulaic and dull, but does recap the point of the paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion is nonexistent or tacked on as an afterthought • Does not adequately sum up the argument

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 1	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
Thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Brief and concise, covers the entirety of the paper's argument •Clearly worded and specific •Introduces theme, importance, and comparison •Obviously located in the introductory paragraph 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A little wordy, but argument remains clear •Is mostly specific, vague in places •Easy to locate in introduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not introduce any or all of the key components of the paper (theme, importance, comparison) •Vague and poorly worded •Missing the "so what?" question •Too long or too short •Buried in introduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not cover the entirety of the argument •Very poorly worded; not argumentative •Very difficult to locate in introduction •Misidentifies theme; focuses on an idea instead
Theme Identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Interesting and fresh; deals with an idea in a new and interesting way •Theme is obvious and understandable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Correctly identifies a theme, though the idea is cliched or has been dealt with at length in class •Theme is understandable but wording needs refinement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Misidentifies theme or confuses a theme with an idea •Recycles concepts already used in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Focuses on an idea, not a theme •Leaves theme out of the thesis and argument
Argument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are seamlessly integrated; the argument's flow is perfect •Argument is unique, creative, well reasoned, and logically argued; it engages the reader •Demonstrates thoughtfulness and close attention to the chosen texts •Discusses aspects of chosen texts in new, fresh ways not thoroughly discussed in class •Stays on prompt and on topic; commentary constantly reemphasizes link to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are well integrated; the argument's flow is almost perfect •Argument is clichéd or obvious, but it still demonstrates careful thought and logic • Pulls from in-class discussions but takes these ideas in new directions • Argument has a few minor logic flaws and fallacies but still proves thesis •Stays on prompt and topic; only rarely fails to link ideas to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles stand out and are not well integrated with new material; sometimes interrupt flow •Argument is superficial and boring; pulls heavily from in-class discussions and demonstrates little new analysis •Does not focus on theme • Essay struggles to prove the thesis in its entirety • Large portions of the essay suffer from logical fallacies that cripple the argument •Misses the prompt or veers off topic; does not consistently link ideas to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are poorly integrated; web article text stands out; argument is often disrupted •Paper does not prove the thesis statement • Argument is simplistic and obvious or misidentifies theme • Essay relies on flawed reasoning and logical fallacies • Recycles classroom discussions in their entiretyFails to address prompt; ideas don't prove thesis; essay is mostly off topic

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 1	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
Importance (the "So What" Question)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of both theme and comparison; does so for every text • Importance is perceptive and stated in the thesis • Each major point is tied to importance through a thorough and convincing discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of both theme and comparison; does so throughout the paper with little exception • Paper reaches a clichéd or obvious conclusion, but proves it well • Most major points answer the "so what?" question, and these conclusions are usually convincingly argued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of either theme or comparison; does so inconsistently • Isn't addressed in the thesis • Paper only addresses importance occasionally • "So what?" question is only discussed superficially or is otherwise unsubstantiated • The stated importance is logically flawed or overly simplistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question does not adequately address importance of theme or comparison; importance is very superficial; argues that "without x, Holmes would not exist/be popular/matter" • Paper largely ignores the comparison's significance • Isn't addressed in the thesis • Stated importance is patently false and demonstrates a misreading of the text
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is used correctly and in appropriate places • Uses direct quotations and paraphrases at appropriate times • Paper uses outside sources to bolster commentary and thesis • Each argumentative point uses the strongest evidence available • Evidence is thoroughly explained and linked to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper sometimes lacks balance between paraphrases and direct quotations, but still uses evidence effectively • Most evidence is contextualized and links back to thesis • Outside sources are usually used to uphold argument, are rarely superfluous • Most argumentative points use strong evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper relies too heavily on either quotations or paraphrases; total lack of balance • Does not use direct quotations or paraphrases in appropriate places • Most evidence is not explained or tied back to thesis • Outside sources are often superfluous and don't help prove the argument • When evidence <i>is</i> used, it is weak or unconvincing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper uses direct quotations and paraphrases as the paper's argument OR paper uses little to no supporting proof • Evidence is unexplained and/or not relevant to thesis • Outside sources are haphazardly thrown in, don't make sense in the context of the argument • Evidence is "tacked on" and not integrated into the paper
Commentary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All opinions are substantiated with appropriate, compelling evidence and make sense • Conclusions of the paper are insightful and on topic • Offers a fresh reading of the texts that keeps the reader's interest • Commentary explains evidence, links texts, and explains importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most opinions are clear and substantiated • Conclusions are slightly obvious but support the thesis • Paper mostly holds the reader's interest • Commentary mostly explains evidence and importance; occasionally struggles to make connections, but not in a way that affects the argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commentary is often boring and loses reader's attention • Some commentary is off topic and/or does not relate to thesis • Unclear commentary confuses the reader and undermines the argument • Commentary fails in one of the following areas: contextualizing evidence, comparison, or explaining importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commentary is confusing and unclear; lacks necessary evidence • Essay loses the reader's attention and/or strays off topic • Commentary often undermines or negates argumentative points • Opinions are unsubstantiated or patently false • Ignores "so what" question; does not link to thesis

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 1	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
<p>Comparison</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Gives balanced time to source texts and pastiches •Comparison is logical and well done; texts are being compared to one another consistently and logically •The importance is consistently addressed in the comparisons, which are topically organized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Slightly overemphasizes pastiches; one source is given slightly less attention than the others •Comparison is mostly logical; very few issues with comparing texts •Answers the "so what?" question in each comparison, though discussion is slightly superficial •Comparisons are organized around topic, not text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comparisons mostly read like separate papers; little direct comparison; direct comparisons are poor or poorly proven •Logic issues with the topical organization; similarities/ differences are elementary or make little sense •"So What" question is only briefly addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Paper reads like three separate sections with little to no direct comparisons •Eschew the "so what" question •Comparisons do not demonstrate logic; poorly discussed and organized •Mentioned as an afterthought; paper focuses on theme but fails to adequately show how texts relate

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 2	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
Thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Brief and concise, covers the entirety of the paper’s argument •Clearly worded and specific •Introduces topic, influence is clearly discussed •Influence clearly centers on Sherlock Holmes; explains the importance of this •Obviously located in the introductory paragraph 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A little wordy, but argument remains clear •Is mostly specific, vague in places •Introduces topic, influence is discussed though suffers from vagueness •Adequately explains the importance of influence •Easy to locate in introduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not introduce any or all of the key components of the paper (theme, importance, comparison) •Vague and poorly worded •Influence deviates from Holmes or is extremely unclear •Fails to address why the influence matters •Missing the “so what?” question •Too long or too short •Buried in introduction •Thesis is not argumentative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not cover the entirety of the argument •Very poorly worded; not argumentative •Very difficult to locate in introduction •Does not identify influence and/or importance; this does not deal with Holmes •Misidentifies theme; focuses on an idea instead
Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Influence is clearly explained and serves as the driving force of the paper •Contextualized in the canon, pastiches, and history •Influence is logical and makes sense; completely historically accurate and well-proven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Influence is clearly explained; paper stays on topic •Influence is logical and makes sense; completely historically accurate, though occasionally lacks substantial proof 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Influence is illogical or poorly explained •Does not consider historical context; ignores the canon •Argument for influence is historically inaccurate •Veers from Holmes; scope is too broad 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Influence is only briefly identified in the concluding paragraphs of the essay •Completely misidentifies influence; argument is patently false •Only addresses Holmes briefly; completely ignores canon
Argument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are seamlessly integrated; the argument’s flow is perfect •Argument is unique, well reasoned, and logically argued; it engages the reader •Demonstrates thoughtfulness and close attention to the trend; deals thoroughly with canonical works •Tracks influence in a convincing and logical fashion •Stays on prompt and on topic; commentary constantly reemphasizes link to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are well integrated; the argument’s flow is almost perfect •Argument is clichéd or obvious, but it still demonstrates careful thought and logic • Handles the trend well with only minor consistency issues; deals with the canonical works • Argument has a few minor logic flaws and fallacies but still proves thesis •Stays on prompt and topic; only rarely fails to link ideas to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles stand out and are not well integrated with new material; sometimes interrupt flow •Argument is superficial and boring; trend is superficial or secondary; offers little analysis • Is research oriented; paper fails to make a real argument •Does not focus influence; ignores importance • Essay struggles to prove the thesis in its entirety • Large portions of the essay suffer from logical fallacies •Misses the prompt; veers off topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Web articles are poorly integrated; web article text stands out; argument is often disrupted •Paper does not prove the thesis statement • Argument is simplistic; misidentifies trend; does not prove trend •Ignores importance; stated importance is superficial (e.g trend keeps Holmes alive) • Essay relies on flawed reasoning and logical fallacies • Fails to address prompt; ideas don’t prove thesis; essay is mostly off topic

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 2	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
<p>Importance (the "So What" Question)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of both theme and comparison; does so for every text • Importance is perceptive and stated in the thesis • Each major point is tied to importance through a thorough and convincing discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of both theme and comparison; does so throughout the paper with little exception • Paper reaches a clichéd or obvious conclusion, but proves it well • Most major points answer the "so what?" question, and these conclusions are usually convincingly argued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question addresses the importance of either theme or comparison; does so inconsistently • Isn't addressed in the thesis • Paper only addresses importance occasionally • "So what?" question is only discussed superficially or is otherwise unsubstantiated • The stated importance is logically flawed or overly simplistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question does not adequately address importance of theme or comparison; importance is very superficial; argues that "without x, Holmes would not exist/be popular/matter" • Paper largely ignores the comparison's significance • Isn't addressed in the thesis • Stated importance is patently false and demonstrates a misreading of the text
<p>Evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is used correctly and in appropriate places • Strong outside sources used to prove both trend and importance • Uses direct quotations and paraphrases at appropriate times; uses outside information alongside the canon • Outside sources to bolster commentary and thesis • Each argumentative point uses the strongest evidence available • Evidence is thoroughly explained and linked to thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper sometimes lacks balance between paraphrases and direct quotations, but still uses evidence effectively • Most evidence is contextualized and links back to thesis • Outside sources are usually used to uphold argument, are rarely superfluous • Evidence is slightly unbalanced between outside sources and canon; canonical works are included • Most argumentative points use strong evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper relies too heavily on either quotations or paraphrases; total lack of balance • Does not use direct quotations or paraphrases in appropriate places • Most evidence is not explained or tied back to thesis • Choice of evidence is poor; evidence often does not prove intended point; evidence does not adequately prove influence, trend, or importance • Some outside sources are superfluous • Substantial sections of paper lack adequate evidence to prove point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper uses direct quotations and paraphrases as the paper's argument OR paper uses little to no supporting proof • Evidence is unexplained and/or not relevant to thesis • Outside sources are not explained; inappropriately used as commentary • Outside sources are haphazardly thrown in, don't make sense in the context of the argument; don't work toward proving influence or importance • Evidence is "tacked on" and not integrated into the paper

Paper 3: Grading Rubric

Paper Option 2	The "A" Paper	The "B" Paper	The "C" Paper	The "D" or "F" Paper
<p>Commentary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All opinions are substantiated with appropriate, compelling evidence and make sense • Conclusions of the paper are insightful and on topic • Offers a fresh perspective • Commentary explains evidence, links texts to explain influence, and strongly argues for importance • Commentary contextualizes sources in a way that explains both influence and importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most opinions are clear and substantiated • Conclusions are slightly obvious but support the thesis • Paper mostly holds the reader's interest • Commentary mostly explains evidence and importance; occasionally struggles to make connections, but not in a way that affects the argument • Most commentary links evidence to influence; commentary logically explains this link 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commentary is often boring and loses reader's attention • Some commentary is off topic and/or does not relate to thesis • Unclear commentary confuses the reader and undermines the argument • Commentary fails in one of the following areas: contextualizing evidence, influence, or explaining importance • Commentary is too brief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commentary is confusing and unclear; lacks necessary evidence • Does not explain influence logically; reads like "fluff"; repetitive and off topic • Essay loses the reader's attention and/or strays off topic • Commentary often undermines or negates argumentative points • Commentary ignores outside sources; outside sources are largely ignored • Opinions are unsubstantiated or patently false • Ignores "so what" question; does not link to thesis