



Standards for Evaluating Papers

Classical Roots of Western Literature • Summer 2004

**Papers are evaluated on a scale running from A+ to C- or No Credit for unacceptable work.
Permission to rewrite papers will be given at my sole discretion.**

- A** Thesis is well developed and clearly focused on all aspects of the assignment
Argumentation is interesting and insightful
Supporting evidence is thorough and relevant
Narrative and description kept to minimum needed for analysis
Conflicting evidence and counter-arguments are consistently acknowledged and accounted for
Introduction clearly announces the thesis and sets out how the issue will be presented
Conclusion emerges logically from main arguments
Footnotes are used when needed; footnotes and bibliography use consistent and appropriate format
Well organized and well written with thoughtful, precise language
Errors of style and structure are few and minor
- B** Thesis is adequately developed but may not adequately cover all aspects of the assignment
Argumentation is strong but may demonstrate occasional omissions or failures
Supporting evidence is less thorough and/or relevant than in top category, but is still substantial
More narrative or description than is necessary at the expense of argumentation
Conflicting evidence and counter-arguments are usually acknowledged and treated
Introduction adequately presents thesis
Conclusion is logical extension of arguments in rest of essay, but may be somewhat weak or unpersuasive
Footnotes usually used when needed; footnotes and bibliography use consistent and appropriate format
Satisfactorily organized and clearly, if not elegantly, written
Errors of style and structure are few but detract from the presentation
- C** Thesis exists but needs further explication or definition and is not adequately focused on assignment
Argumentation is confused and difficult to follow or assertion dominates over argumentation
Supporting evidence is adequate but sparse, or its relevance is not always made clear
Too much narrative or description at expense of analysis
Little concern for conflicting evidence and counter-arguments or they are not refuted convincingly
Introduction overly terse, lengthy, or confused to be effective or does not agree with conclusion
Conclusion is insufficiently related to arguments in paper
Footnotes are not always used when needed; footnotes and bibliography may sometimes use inconsistent and/or inappropriate format
Adequate organization and style but structural flaws or mechanical errors compromise the presentation
- NC** Thesis is unclear, unproven, or even missing and fails to address the assignment
Supporting evidence is irrelevant or missing; essay relies on assertion rather than demonstration
Narrative or description far outweigh analysis
No treatment of conflicting evidence or counter-arguments
Conclusion fails to draw on arguments in the paper or is missing
Footnotes and/or bibliography are absent or improperly formatted
Deficient organization, mechanics, and style result in an incoherent paper
Deviates from prescribed format for assignment
Inappropriate/non-academic style
Paper is plagiarized in part or whole
Paper lacks a completed (and accurate) "Checklist For Papers"