<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A / B+      | ❑ reveals excellent and insightful understanding of the work  
❑ demonstrates knowledge/understanding of literary/historical context  
❑ creates a focused, insightful, interesting and persuasive, even original, analysis/interpretation of the work  
❑ supports interpretation thoroughly and persuasively with quotations from/references to the work  
❑ establishes the context of quotations and makes clear how they support/illustrate interpretation  
❑ states or implies clearly and effectively a thesis that presents a significant point and links it to the essay’s other key pts  
❑ focuses on the ways in which the writer’s choices—of language, structure, technique, style, etc.—shape meaning/effect  
❑ has a clear and coherent structure, with transitions that reveal the logic of the writer’s thinking  
❑ has fully developed, specific paragraphs that reveal depth of insight and analysis  
❑ has a strong and mature writing voice that utilizes a wide vocabulary and varying sentence structure  
❑ employs clear, precise and accurate language—with no mechanical, grammatical, or formatting errors |
| EXCELLENT   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| To         | ❑ shows very good understanding of the work  
❑ demonstrates very good knowledge/understanding of literary/historical context, although there may be misreading/confusion at points, or too little said about context  
❑ makes several interesting/insightful interpretive points, although these may not converge as a persuasive analysis  
❑ explores ideas with some if not fully realized depth of focus  
❑ supports interpretation most of the time with quotations from/references to the work  
❑ uses quotations, but not always with sufficient explanation of their context and/or of how they support the thesis  
❑ leans towards an argument, but may be engaging in too much summary and/or may not adequately pursue implications, answer the “so what” question  
❑ seems aware of the writer’s choices—of language, structure, technique, style, etc.—but does not address these in a sufficiently pointed or detailed way  
❑ suggests a structure, but is not always fully in control of this; transitions may be mechanical or missing  
❑ uses generally well-focused if somewhat underdeveloped paragraphs, making the overall analysis seem inconsistent in quality and effectiveness  
❑ has a generally mature writing voice, but may demonstrate a limited range of vocabulary / sentence structure  
❑ employs clear and mostly precise, accurate language, but with a few mechanical, grammatical, or formatting errors |
| GOOD       | ❑ demonstrates adequate understanding of the work  
❑ shows some knowledge/understanding of literary/historical context, although there may be confusion and/or too little said about this  
❑ attempts analysis, although it is fairly conventional or lacks persuasiveness at key points  
❑ offers what is more informed summary, less analysis of the work  
❑ lacks sufficient focus on a central idea/assertion  
❑ sometimes supports interpretation with quotations from/references to the work, but too often does not and/or chooses passages that are not clearly related to the points being made  
❑ attempts a thesis, but this is more nearly description or summary than analysis  
❑ may be aware of the writer, and may mention the writer’s choices—of language, structure, technique, style, etc.—but does so inconsistently, and/or may fail to comment on their meaning/effects  
❑ has a structure that is either wholly mechanical—a list of points or an informed summary of the text—or lacks sufficient structure/coherence  
❑ has paragraphs but they too often lack focus and/or development, so that the essay feels choppy and/or haphazard  
❑ has a writing voice that is inconsistent and/or lacks confidence, and that lacks sufficient control of vocabulary / sentence structure  
❑ contains persistent and sometimes distracting mechanical, grammatical, or formatting errors |

| C to C-     | ❑ demonstrates adequate understanding of the work  
❑ shows some knowledge/understanding of literary/historical context, although there may be confusion and/or too little said about this  
❑ attempts analysis, although it is fairly conventional or lacks persuasiveness at key points  
❑ offers what is more informed summary, less analysis of the work  
❑ lacks sufficient focus on a central idea  
❑ sometimes supports interpretation with quotations from/references to the work, but too often does not and/or chooses passages that are not clearly related to the points being made  
❑ attempts a thesis, but this is more nearly description or summary than analysis  
❑ may be aware of the writer, and may mention the writer’s choices—of language, structure, technique, style, etc.—but does so inconsistently, and/or may fail to comment on their meaning/effects  
❑ has a structure that is either wholly mechanical—a list of points or an informed summary of the text—or lacks sufficient structure/coherence  
❑ has paragraphs but they too often lack focus and/or development, so that the essay feels choppy and/or haphazard  
❑ has a writing voice that is inconsistent and/or lacks confidence, and that lacks sufficient control of vocabulary / sentence structure  
❑ contains persistent and sometimes distracting mechanical, grammatical, or formatting errors |

| D/F         | Combines one or more of these serious weaknesses/failures:  
❑ makes serious misstatements about the work and/or its context  
❑ raises the suspicion that the writer has not read/finished reading the work  
❑ makes virtually no attempt at analysis/interpretation of the work  
❑ offers only summary of the work, and one that is not always accurate  
❑ incorporates no or too few references to the work  
❑ has either no interpretation of the work or offers one that seriously misreads it  
❑ does not address/analyze/appreciate the writer’s choices—of language, structure, technique, style, etc.  
❑ creates an overall presentation that is disorganized, showing little or no perceptible structure/organization  
❑ either ignores paragraphing, or creates paragraphs that are too short, too long, or that lack focus/coherence  
❑ is uncomfortably short  
❑ has a confused/confusing writing voice, with little sense of appropriate register/tone and too little control of vocabulary/sentence structure  
❑ contains mechanical, confusing, and/or formatting errors that distract from meaning  
❑ does not in general reach a standard described by above criteria |

| F           | Comments:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |