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| **Humanities Core: Environment | Encounter | Entanglement****Grading Rubric for Essay 2: Literary Analysis of Vandermeer’s *Annihilation*** |
|  | **Argumentation** | **Organization** | **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  | Essay presents in-depth literary analysis of two or more passages of the novel (close reading, narrative, stylistic, and figurative analysis) and makes insightful part-to-whole connections that reflect sustained thematic engagement with the text | Evidence is insightfully selected from the primary source and artfully integrated and explained using summary, paraphrase, and quotation; responsible source attribution and 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 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 | Essay adequately applies the conventions of literary analysis to two or more passages of the novel (close reading, narrative, stylistic, and figurative analysis) and makes part-to-whole connections that reflect thematic engagement with the text  | Evidence is well-selected from the primary source, properly integrated using summary, paraphrase, and quotation, and explained when necessary; responsible source attribution and 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 attempts to apply conventions of literary analysis to at least two passages of the novel (close reading, narrative, stylistic, and figurative analysis), but inadequately identifies or explicates some literary features of the text; part-to-whole connections may not demonstrate thematic engagement with the text | Evidence is mostly well-selected from the primary source, but may be ineffectively integrated in summary, paraphrase or quotation and/or lack explanation; responsible source attribution and 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 fails either to adopt methods appropriate to the task of literary analysis or to make part-to-whole connections that demonstrate thematic engagement with the text | 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 source attribution and 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 literary analysis and to make part-to-whole connections that demonstrate thematic engagement with the text | Essay does not provide evidence from primary source in support of argument; source attributions and/or citations absent; essay may present fabricated quotations or misrepresent the content of sources | Persistent errors in language and mechanics demonstrate a lack of revision and obscure the writer’s own ideas and voice; essay may present artificially-produced text as if it were the writer’s own language |