

## Myth Paper Rubric

For specifics, see <http://cal.byu.edu/macfarlane/MacfarlaneMythPaperAssignment.htm>

	Inadequate: Consider Rewrite [ <b>&lt;6</b> ]	Novice: Short of Standard [ <b>6/7</b> ]		Proficient: Meets Standard [ <b>8/9</b> ]		Exemplary: Exceeds Standard [ <b>9 / 10</b> ]
	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
	Substandard in several ways. Consultation recommended.	Weaknesses edge out strengths, overall. Recommend consult.		Adequate.		The paper could easily be held up as a positive model for the class to follow.
<b>Topic</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Topic does not meet the assignment's criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> Topic is common. It could have been found with a quick google search. The topic limits original analysis.		<input type="checkbox"/> Topic demonstrates your engagement with the course's objective, i.e. personalized study of mythological reception. [Not-in-OGCMA* doesn't necessarily elevate grade; but a cleverly chosen topic helps.]		<input type="checkbox"/> An intriguing topic allows for and invites novel investigation.
<b>Thesis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No thesis statement whatever. The paper never stakes a claim.	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete thesis statement lacks a clear, recognizable assertion in thesis. Weak assertion lacks the <i>that</i> and the <i>why</i> .		<input type="checkbox"/> A particular assertion in thesis provides focus and direction to the essay. The <i>that</i> and the <i>why</i> are adequately articulated in thesis.		<input type="checkbox"/> A clearly stated, compelling, refined thesis leads to intelligent analysis; succinct summary as necessary. <i>That</i> and <i>why</i> are clear and insightful.
<b>Analysis &amp; Argument</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary of plot prevails fills more than half the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Plot summary outweighs analysis.		<input type="checkbox"/> Some analysis outweighs adequate summary. [50% demonstrates artist's conscious acknowledgement, 50% on narrative gain.]		<input type="checkbox"/> Analysis prevails and enhances the thesis in a compelling way. Space not time is the limiting factor. Reader feels that author really understands the topic.
<b>Evidence</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ideas seem to be borrowed without appropriate credit to sources. Paper seems like a website download for worse. Evidence cited from easy sites, and lacks real analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient or inappropriate sources that may be integrated, but awkwardly. Fails to dig deeper than OGCMA or textbook. Author may not give appropriate credit for others' ideas. Chicago style not used in footnotes.		<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Integrates at least 2 appropriate scholarly sources.</u> [Common internet sites are OK, if used judiciously.] Sources are introduced smoothly. Author credits sources carefully. Tidy footnotes comply w/ Chicago Style. (See <a href="https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/717/01/">purdueowl: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/717/01/</a> )		<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Engages</u> two or more appropriate scholarly sources. Demonstrates exceptional depth of research (actual library work, not mere on-line skimming). Articles and books are up-to-date and appropriate to topic. Flawless adherence to Chicago documentation.
<b>Organization</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization impedes the clear flow of the paper's key idea.	<input type="checkbox"/> Paper lacks clear, transparent organization. Characterized by poor flow and coherence		<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, transparent organization. Characterized by coherence and flow within sections. Transitions may be formulaic or mechanical.		<input type="checkbox"/> Organized conceptually rather than formulaically. Consistent coherence and flow. Transitions move beyond the formulaic or mechanical.
<b>Rhetorical Tone</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks clear sense of rhetorical appropriateness. Signs of a late, hastily written draft.	<input type="checkbox"/> Essay fails to maintain full rhetorical appropriateness. More than a couple of grammatical errors and other indicators of a first draft.		<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an awareness of subject, audience, occasion, and purpose. Stylistic choices are appropriate for rhetorical situation. A stray typographical error is permissible, but seems out of place.		<input type="checkbox"/> Consistent voice (style, tone, and point of view appropriate to subject, audience, occasion, and purpose). Lean. Fluff-free. Manifests characteristics of finished writing.
<b>Formal Elements</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Several formal elements are missing. The paper <i>looks like</i> a first draft.	<input type="checkbox"/> Two or more formal mistakes, prescribed four-part header, two-page violation, OGCMA reference, etc.		<input type="checkbox"/> One or no formal mistakes. Four-part header is correct. The paper is complete.		<input type="checkbox"/> No formal mistakes. Two very full, but neat pages. Maybe the author is irked that <i>only two pages were allowed!</i>

\*J. Davidson Reid, *Oxford Guide to Classical Mythology in the Arts, 1400-1990s* (Oxford University Press, 1994).

**Reader's Notes** (primarily for elements of an essay not covered by the rubric) perhaps see flipside: