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General Directions: This scoring guide will be useful for most of the papers you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific paper, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Do not assign a score of 0 or – without this consultation.

Your score should reflect your judgment of the paper’s quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write; the paper, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the paper as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All papers, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into your holistic evaluation of a paper’s overall quality. In no case should you score a paper with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.

---

9 Papers earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 papers and, in addition, are especially full or apt in their analysis or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

8 Papers earning a score of 8 effectively analyze how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values. These papers may refer to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The prose demonstrates an ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

7 Papers earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 papers, but provide a more complete analysis or demonstrate a more mature prose style.

6 Papers earning a score of 6 adequately analyze how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values. These papers may refer to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

5 Papers earning a score of 5 analyze how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values, but do so unevenly, inconsistently, or insufficiently. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the writer’s ideas.

4 Papers earning a score of 4 respond to the prompt inadequately. They may offer little discussion of how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values, misrepresent these strategies, or analyze incorrectly their relation to Lord Chesterfield’s values. The prose generally conveys the writer’s ideas but may suggest immature control of writing.

3 Papers earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for a score of 4, but are less perceptive about how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values or less consistent in controlling the elements of writing.
Question 1 (cont’d.)

2 Papers earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in analyzing how the rhetorical strategies Lord Chesterfield uses reveal his values. These papers may misunderstand the prompt, offer vague generalizations, substitute simpler tasks such as summarizing the passage, or simply list rhetorical strategies. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing.

1 Papers earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for a score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their analysis, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt.

— Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.
Question 2

General Directions: This scoring guide will be useful for most of the papers you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific paper, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Do not assign a score of 0 or – without this consultation.

Your score should reflect your judgment of the paper’s quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write; the paper, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the paper as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All papers, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into your holistic evaluation of a paper’s overall quality. In no case should you score a paper with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.

9 Papers earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 papers and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their explanation and argument or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

8 Papers earning a score of 8 effectively characterize opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and clearly propose a solution or compromise. The evidence used is appropriate and convincing. The prose demonstrates an ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

7 Papers earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 papers, but provide a more complete explanation and argument or demonstrate a more mature prose style.

6 Papers earning a score of 6 adequately characterize opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and propose a solution or compromise. The evidence used is appropriate. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

5 Papers earning a score of 5 characterize opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and propose a solution or compromise. These papers may, however, provide uneven, inconsistent, or limited explanations of the issue, the opposing positions, and/or the solution or compromise. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the writer’s ideas.

4 Papers earning a score of 4 respond to the prompt inadequately. They may have difficulty characterizing opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and/or proposing a solution. The evidence used may be insufficient. The prose generally conveys the writer’s ideas but may suggest immature control of writing.

3 Papers earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for a score of 4, but demonstrate less success in characterizing the opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and/or proposing a solution and less control of writing.
Question 2 (cont’d.)

2 Papers earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in characterizing opposing positions on a local, national, or global issue and/or proposing a solution. These papers may misunderstand the prompt; fail to characterize opposing positions, and/or propose a solution or compromise; or substitute a simpler task by responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated, inaccurate, or inappropriate evidence. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing.

1 Papers earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for a score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their explanation and argument, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt.

— Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.
Question 3

**General Directions:** This scoring guide will be useful for most of the papers you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific paper, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Do not assign a score of 0 or – without this consultation.

Your score should reflect your judgment of the paper’s quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write; the paper, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the paper as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All papers, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into your holistic evaluation of a paper’s overall quality. In no case should you score a paper with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.

---

9 Papers earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 papers and, in addition, are especially full or apt in their analysis or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

8 Papers earning a score of 8 effectively analyze how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings. These papers may refer to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The prose demonstrates an ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

7 Papers earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 papers, but provide a more complete analysis or demonstrate a more mature prose style.

6 Papers earning a score of 6 adequately analyze how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings. These papers may refer to the passage explicitly or implicitly. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

5 Papers earning a score of 5 analyze how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings but do so unevenly, inconsistently, or insufficiently. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the writer’s ideas.

4 Papers earning a score of 4 respond to the prompt inadequately. They may analyze incorrectly, or merely paraphrase, or offer little discussion of how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings, or they may misrepresent his position. The prose generally conveys the writer’s ideas but may suggest immature control of writing.

3 Papers earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for a score of 4, but are less perceptive about how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings or less consistent in controlling the elements of writing.
Question 3 (cont’d.)

2 Papers earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in analyzing how Rodriguez uses contrasts between Mexico and California to explore and convey his conflicting feelings. These papers may misunderstand the prompt, offer vague generalizations, substitute simpler tasks such as summarizing the passage, or simply list features of Rodriguez’s text. The prose often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing.

1 Papers earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for a score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their analysis, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt.

— Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.