ANALYSIS ESSAY SCORING GUIDE

9/8-specific references/references that are blended in and explained (seamlessly integrated)\*free of plot summary that is not relevant to the question\*complex, varied sentence\*elevated diction\*reiterates devices’ connection to prompt\*organization is clear and logical (first to last)\*intro&conclusion=strong\*thought provoking\*direct quotes&paraphrasing \*throrough analysis of why the author made particular choices\*insightful tone\* imitates the style of the passage\* parallel structure\*thoroughly proves answer to the prompt\*connecting scholarly commentary to the overall meaning\*thesis is clear, focused, narrow & direct \*mature in style and vocabulary \*tight link of support to author’s intent \*attempts more challenging concepts (symbolism, extended metaphor, organization, irony, paradox, satire )\*perfect grammar \*sophisticated, complex, specific, consistent\* artful transitions

7- elevated vocabulary\* answers the prompt \* notes changes in tone \* explains the effects of the author’s persuasive devices \*accurately labels devices \*transitions words \*organized \*SOAPSTone \*explains quotations and their connections to the prompt \*analyzes diction and its effect \* analyzes syntax and its effect \*analyzes figures of speech and their effects \*analyzes tone and how it is conveyed \*very few grammar/mechanical errors \*well-written but with less maturity and control \*less thorough, less perceptive, or less specific than 9/8 papers \*demonstrate student’s ability to analyze a literary work, but reveal a more limited understanding and less stylistic maturity than do upper papers\*thinner version of excellent paper, still impressive, cogent, convincing, but less well handled in terms of organization, insight, or vocabulary\*has potential but hasn’t quite gotten all of it \*support is fair but commentary needs development\*these papers tend to have two out of three points that are well made and are in depth, but then one point may be weak, superficial or incorrect \*fluid in style \* often one section is well developed by student is affected by time \*attempts more difficult tasks \*sense of completion

6-avg. voc. &grammar; typical beginning ( a little bit generic) \*like a formula paper \*needs more transition words to improve coherence \*answers the prompt but needs to reiterate evidence+prompt connection \* needs better organization \*a little repetitive with points or examples \*sentences rarely vary in length \*average paper but is deficient in one of the essential mentioned above \*less mature in thought or less well handled in terms of organization, syntax, or mechanics\*explanation/commentary/analysis is inadequate or weak, too general or fails to prove a point \*inconsistent but adequate \*less difficult concepts (diction)\*occasional insight \*thesis is often in three parts \*paragraphs organized by device \*summary \*careless errors \*less thorough develop of why the author made his/her choices \*need more evidence \*”reader” dependence instead of true analysis \*verb tenses are in past tense-they should be in present \*passive voice sentences \*wordy/less concise

5- safe and plastic \*superficial \*discussion of meaning may be formulaic, mechanical or inadequately related to the chose details \*immature control of writing \*the meaning may be inaccurate or insubstantial and not relating to the question \*part of prompt question may be omitted altogether \*needs much more evidence \*grammar/spelling mistakes \*writing may convey the writer’s ideas, but it reveals a weak control over such elements \*not as well conceived as upper papers \*there is some effort to produce analysis \*formulaic \*limited with simple sentences; average, ordinary word choice or odd word choice \*diction may be marred by repetitions and imprecision \*addresses the prompt \*organization is there, but confusing in some places \*mechanics/legibility is a consistent problem \*repetitive

4-discussion is likely to be unpersuasive, perfunctory, underdeveloped, or misguided \*The meanings student deduce may be inaccurate or insubstantial and not clearly related to the question \*part of the question might be missing altogether \*significant misinterpretations of the question or the work they discuss \*they may contain little, if any supporting evidence \*they may practice more paraphrasing and plot summary \*the papers only LIST \*poor analogies/allusions \*paraphrasing through over quoting \*clichés \*limited analysis \*words like “obviously,” “you,” and colloquial diction (a lot) \*sentences are awkward, ambiguous, confusing, \*little sentence variety \*essay is hard to understand due to grammar \*simple word choice \*words used incorrectly \*slang \*odd phrasing \*misinterpretations \*poor organization \*incorrect SOAPTone \*misunderstand prompt

1-3-misread the prompt \*didn’t answer the prompt \*too short \*too little information \*no examples \*no analysis \*poor grammar \*off topic \*no mention of strategies