|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Humanities Core: Worldbuilding**  **Grading Rubric for Essay 4: Historical Film Analysis of Worldbuilding in Kalatozov’s *I Am Cuba*** | | | | | | |
|  | **Argumentation** | **Organization** | **Interpretive Methodology** | **Research Methodology** | **Evidence** | **Language and Voice** |
| **A** | Essay is controlled by a specific, arguable, and complex thesis that reflects a sophisticated, nuanced, and/or original interpretation of the topic; argumentation is unified and coherent throughout essay | Sequencing of ideas is not only logical but adds to the rhetorical impact of the essay; paragraph structure is dynamically linked to topic sentences and the main thesis of the essay; transitions create momentum; introduction and conclusion actively engage the reader and convey a sense of purpose and broader implication to the inquiry | Specific evidence drawn from close viewing of mise-en-scène, cinematography, sound, and editing supports and accentuates overall interpretation; analysis of the film’s historical context and reception is insightful and complex; essay speaks to narrative and technical dimensions of the film’s depiction of historical actors and events, cultural perspectives, power relationships, and political goals | 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 | Evidence is insightfully selected from primary and secondary sources and artfully integrated and explained using summary, paraphrase, and quotation; proper MLA citation practice is followed in the body text and in the Works Cited page | Effectively crafted language demonstrates engagement with the writer’s rhetorical situation; precision of argument and ideas enhanced by writer’s attention to voice and conscious application of stylistic choices |
| **B** | Essay is controlled by a specific, arguable, and complex thesis that reflects a proficient interpretation of the topic; argumentation is largely unified and coherent throughout essay | Sequencing of ideas is logical and effective, leading to essay-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; introduction and conclusion are rhetorically effective | Evidence drawn from close viewing of mise-en-scène, cinematography, sound, and editing supports overall interpretation; reconstruction of context is apt and grounded in understanding of the film’s production history and reception; essay includes aspects of the film’s depiction of historical actors and events, cultural perspectives, power relationships, and political goals | 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 | Evidence is well-selected from primary and secondary sources, properly integrated using summary, paraphrase, and quotation, and explained when necessary; proper MLA citation practice is followed in the body text and in the Works Cited page | Writer’s ideas are expressed clearly and effectively; language and mechanics reflect thorough revision and awareness of voice |
| **C** | Essay may be controlled by a factual statement, but the articulation of the central idea is inarguable and/or lacks specificity and/or complexity; argumentation may lack unity or coherence in parts of the essay | 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; introduction and conclusion are adequate but unengaging | Essay may inadequately identify or analyze aspects of mise-en-scène, cinematography, sound, and/or editing; analysis of the film’s historical context and/or reception may be underdeveloped; essay may inadequately address aspects of the film’s depiction of historical actors and events, cultural perspectives, power relationships, and/or political goals | 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 | Evidence is mostly well-selected from primary and secondary sources, but may be ineffectively integrated in summary, paraphrase or quotation and/or lack explanation; MLA citation practice is largely consistent, but may contain some errors in the body text or Works Cited page | Language may be imprecise and/or mechanics may be inapt but these lapses rarely impede the clarity of ideas; essay reflects the writer’s developing voice and the benefits of the revision process |
| **D** | Essay may exhibit a general idea, but its articulation is non-factual, inarguable, vague, and/or undefined; essay as a whole lacks unity or coherence in argumentation | Logical sequencing of ideas hampered by major lapses or digressions; topic sentences absent or ineffective in paragraph construction; transitions between paragraphs are absent; introduction and conclusion are underdeveloped | Essay either fails to identify relevant components of mise-en-scène, cinematography, sound, and editing, or fails to appropriately situate and analyze these filmmaking features within a historical context | Paper fails to identify or erroneously describes existing scholarly interpretations, conversations, and/or key components of specific secondary sources | Evidence is poorly selected for the purpose of the argument; essay merely lists evidence, contains unnecessary repetitions, or leaves evidence unexplained; significant errors present in MLA citation practice | Frequent errors in language and mechanics impede the communication of ideas and demonstrate incomplete revision; writer’s own voice is underdeveloped |
| **F** | Essay exhibits no discernable central idea; little or no logical advancement of argument | Essay exhibits no logical sequencing, academic paragraph structure, transitions, introduction, and/or conclusion | Essay fails to adopt methods appropriate to the task of film and/or historical analysis | Paper fails to  adopt methods appropriate to representing existing research in the humanities | Essay does not provide evidence in support of argument; responsible citation practices are absent | Persistent errors in language and mechanics demonstrate a lack of revision and obscure the writer’s own ideas and voice |