Existential Literature PHIL 489

Grading Rubric for: **Final Paper**, Worth 40%

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator’s Student Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research and Exposition** |  | **/18** |
| Needs Work (1 point) | Competent (2 points) | Exemplary (3 points) |
| The paper picks up the ideas of an in-class presentation, but uses it merely as a jumping off point for a larger topic **(2 points)** | The paper clearly sides with or against a position taken by the presentation in question, and makes a convincing argument in either or both direction **(4 points)** | Synthesizing (some) major idea(s) and research of a presentation, the paper goes beyond the original presentation both in research and in philosophical, historical, and(or) rhetorical implications **(6 points)** |
| Almost no historical research and context is given | The paper includes research on the historical context of the given work or author, but it falls short of offering further insight into the intentions of the work or author in question | Research into the historical context of the given work, or author, allows for a stronger understanding of the situation in which the work was written, illuminating the authors intentions and situating the work within the literary and philosophical discussion of the time |
| Inadequate philosophical exposition of theories mentioned is done | Philosophical exposition lacks clarity, yet it is able to bring to light themes surrounding the literary work or historical context | Philosophical expositions of relevant ideas relating to the literary work are well formulated and concise, clearly establishing key themes as being integrally related to the text |
| Literary rhetorical argument is unconvincing and textual evidence rarely given | Textual evidence helps to explain what it is that the author is trying to say, but the rhetorical argument made by the paper could be improved | Critical analysis of the literary work is rhetorically robust, creatively reimagining the meaning of the work while referring to applicable textual evidence |
| Facts or other references often go uncited; class discussion or presentations are cited without doing the research to confirm or deny their truth and validity | Facts and other references are cited, but there are either too many or too little of them | Outside sources are used where they are applicable or needed |
| **Introduction** |  | **/9** |
| No clear thesis/introductory statement is provided; focus of the paper is unclear | Writer adequately explains topic and why the topic is chosen | Very clear thesis is articulated and focused in on |
| Little or no context is provided | Writer includes discussion of context, but could be clearer | Clear context of topic is provided |
| Does not give a clear structure of paper | Gives a structure, but it is either not clear or not followed in paper | A structure is clearly predicted for the paper and is held to |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Argument** |  | **/15** |
| Each paragraph lacks supporting, detailed sentences. Lacks depth - too cursory/ summative | Each paragraph has sufficient supporting sentences that develop the main idea. In- depth for part/most of the paper | Each paragraph has thoughtful supportive sentences that develop the main idea. There is an in-depth discussion in all sections |
| Little to no evidence of structure or organization | Paragraph development present but not perfected | Writer demonstrates logical and subtle sequences of ideas through well-developed paragraphs. Transitions are used to enhance organization |
| The paper does not demonstrate that the writer has fully understood and applied concepts | The paper demonstrates that the writer understands and has applied concepts learned through research. Yet, some conclusions are not supported | The paper demonstrates that the writer fully understands and has applied the concepts learned through research. Writer is also able to integrate their own insights. |
| The paper does not acknowledge other views | The paper begins to acknowledge the possibility of other points of view | The paper recognizes the thesis’ limits and follows out the implications, where applicable |
| The writer does not define or improperly defines terms | The writer attempts to define terms, but not always successfully | The writer defines terms with more than simple quotes. Successfully uses terms |
| **Conclusion** |  | **/6** |
| Conclusion does not adequately restate the thesis | Conclusion restates the thesis | Conclusion is engaging and restates the thesis |
| The conclusion did not state why the paper was necessary/important/relevant | The conclusion attempted to state why the paper is important/relevant | The conclusion clearly states why the paper is important and/or relevant |
| **Style/Mechanics** |  | **/18** |
| Heading or title page not present | Heading or title page is incomplete | Heading or title page has: title, name, class, date… MLA formatted |
| Many errors in sentence structure and word usage | Some errors in sentence structure and word usage | Few to no errors in sentence structure or word usage |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Many errors in punctuation, capitalization and spelling | Few errors in punctuation, capitalization and spelling | No errors in punctuation, capitalization or spelling |
| MLA citation style not adopted | Few errors when using MLA citation style | No errors while using MLA citation style |
| Work Cited not present | Work Cited present, but not properly formatted to meet MLA standards | Work Cited formatted correctly with no errors. |
| Format does not adhere to MLA guidelines | Format mostly adheres to MLA guidelines | Format fully adheres to MLA guidelines |

|  |
| --- |
| Total: /66 |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments:  |