| **Humanities Core: Worldbuilding**  **Grading Rubric for Final Research Paper** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Argumentation** | **Organization** | **Interpretive Methodology** | **Research Methodology** | **Evidence** | **Language and Mechanics** |
| **A** | Paper is controlled by an arguable, complex, and specific thesis that reflects a sophisticated, nuanced, and/or original interpretation of primary source(s) and intervention into existing scholarly conversation(s); argumentation is unified and coherent throughout paper; significance of interpretive intervention is thoughtfully framed | Sequencing of ideas is not only logical but adds to the rhetorical impact of the paper; paragraph structure is dynamically linked to topic sentences and the main thesis of the paper; transitions create momentum; title, introduction, and conclusion actively engage the reader and convey a sense of purpose and broader implication to the inquiry | Innovatively examines the way that the form, genre, and rhetorical strategy of the primary source shape its meaning in well-defined contexts and for specific audiences; poses research questions and adopts the appropriate stance, style, and genre conventions of humanistic methodologies relevant to the chosen primary source(s) | Representation of and engagement with existing scholarly interpretations and conversations is insightful and complex; deftly identifies relevant central arguments and counterarguments, disciplinary perspective, rhetorical strategy, and use of evidence in secondary sources; demonstrates advanced information literacy skills for conducting research in multiple online academic databases | Evidence is insightfully selected from primary source and at least six scholarly, peer-reviewed secondary sources and artfully integrated into body paragraphs using direct quotation, paraphrase, and summary where rhetorically and methodologically appropriate; proper MLA citation practice is followed in the body text, captions, and Works Cited page | Virtually no errors in word choice, grammar, or orthography; exhibits style |
| **B** | Paper is controlled by an arguable, complex, and specific thesis that reflects a proficient interpretation of primary source(s) and intervention into existing scholarly conversation(s); argumentation is largely unified and coherent throughout paper; significance of interpretive intervention is clearly stated | Sequencing of ideas is logical and effective, leading to paper-level cohesion; each paragraph is unified and organized around a topic sentence linked to the main thesis; transitions between paragraphs are indicated both formally and conceptually; title, introduction, and conclusion are rhetorically effective | Attends directly to the way that the form, genre, and rhetorical strategy of the primary source shape its meaning in well-defined contexts and for specific audiences; poses research questions and adopts the appropriate stance, style, and genre conventions of humanistic methodologies relevant to the chosen primary source(s) | Representation of and engagement with existing scholarly interpretations and conversation is competent and apt; identifies relevant central arguments and counterarguments, disciplinary perspective, rhetorical strategy, and use of evidence in secondary sources; demonstrates adept information literacy skills for conducting research in multiple online academic databases | Evidence is well-selected from primary source and at least six scholarly, peer-reviewed secondary sources; evidence is properly integrated into paragraphs and contextualized using direct quotation, paraphrase, and summary where rhetorically and methodologically appropriate; proper MLA citation practice is followed in the body text, captions, and Works Cited page | Few errors in word choice, grammar, and/or orthography and none that impede clarity of ideas; exhibits attention to proofreading and formatting |
| **C** | Paper may be controlled by a factual statement, but interpretation of primary source(s) and/or representation of existing scholarly conversation(s) lacks specificity and complexity; argumentation and/or statement of significance may lack unity or coherence in parts of the paper | Some lapses or digressions from the logical sequencing of ideas; topic sentences govern the construction of most paragraphs, but some are vague or less unified; some transitions between paragraphs are artificial or unconvincing; title, introduction, and/or conclusion are adequate but unengaging | Paper may address the way that the form, genre, and/or rhetorical strategy of the primary source shape its meaning and reception but may be vague or ill-defined in one or more aspects of that analysis; may not pose research questions or adopt stance, style, and/or genre conventions appropriate to humanistic methodologies relevant to the chosen primary source(s) | Paper may inadequately represent or engage with existing scholarly interpretations and conversations; paper may identify key structural components of secondary sources but not always in service of claims; demonstrates information literacy skills for conducting research in multiple online academic databases | Evidence is mostly well-selected from at least six scholarly, peer-reviewed secondary sources, but may be ineffectively integrated or lack contextualization; MLA citation practice is largely consistent, but may contain some errors in the body text, captions, and Works Cited page | Some errors in word choice, grammar, and/or orthography may be present but rarely impede clarity of ideas; exhibits some attention to proofreading and formatting |
| **D** | Paper may exhibit a general idea, but Interpretation of primary source(s) and/or representation of scholarly conversation(s) is vague and/or undefined; paper as a whole lacks unity or coherence in argumentation and/or statement of significance | Logical sequencing of ideas hampered by major lapses or digressions; topic sentences absent or ineffective in paragraph construction; transitions between paragraphs are absent; title, introduction, and/or conclusion are underdeveloped | Paper fails to address how form, genre, and/or rhetorical strategy shapes meaning and reception; fails to adopt major component of a humanistic methodology relevant to the primary source and/or poses non-humanistic research questions | Paper fails to identify or erroneously describes existing scholarly interpretations, conversations, and/or key components of specific secondary sources; fails to demonstrate information literacy skills for conducting research in multiple online academic databases | Evidence from primary and secondary sources is poorly selected for the purpose of the argument; paper merely lists evidence, contains unnecessary repetitions, or leaves evidence unexplained; significant errors present in MLA citation practice | Errors in word choice, grammar, and/or orthography are frequent and/or impede clarity of ideas; little or no attention to proofreading and formatting |
| **F** | Paper exhibits no discernable central idea; little or no logical advancement of argument or sense of significance to project | Paper exhibits no logical sequencing, academic paragraph structure, transitions, or rhetorically-motivated title, introduction, and/or conclusion | Paper exhibits no discernable attention to form, genre, and/or rhetorical situation; fails to adopt humanistic research questions or methodology appropriate to primary source | Paper fails to  adopt methods appropriate to the task of a research project in the humanities | Paper does not provide evidence from primary and/or secondary sources in support of argument; responsible citation practices are absent | Persistent errors in word choice, grammar, and orthography; no attention to proofreading and formatting |