

summary

Assessment Category	Rubric	Tally
Excellent	<p>1. Thesis: Chapter/exhibition has a clear point to prove, and this is stated explicitly and elegantly in the introduction.</p> <p>2. Organization: From the introduction, the reader has a good picture of the themes of the chapter/exhibition, and the kind of evidence (visual, archaeological, literary, historical, etc.) that will be used. The rest of the paper follows this organizational scheme well.</p> <p>3. Evidence: Both visual evidence from formal analysis and secondary sources are used well. Footnotes are used appropriately and are in correct form. The sources in the bibliography are correctly cited (author, title, journal name and number/publisher, year of publication). They are relevant to the stated theme and the objects chosen. The annotations explain clearly how they are relevant and complement each other.</p> <p>4. Writing: The paper is cleanly written and has relatively few errors. It is clear, vivid, and specific. The student has used the final draft to correct earlier errors, and in addition, has made substantive revisions as appropriate.</p>	1
Passable	<p>1. Thesis: There is a point to prove, though it is not stated as clearly or explicitly as it might be.</p> <p>2. Organization: The themes are not all clear, and while some evidence is cited, it may not all be relevant to the themes. There is an underlying organizational scheme, although it is not as clearly signalled as it should be, and transitions are not always well marked.</p> <p>3. Evidence: Some visual analysis and citations from the secondary literature are present. However, in some cases the student needed to cite more evidence to support conclusions. The footnotes and bibliography are roughly accurate.</p> <p>4. Writing: The writing is comprehensible, but can be unclear or awkward. It is more vague and less vivid than an excellent paper, and there are still some careless errors. Revisions have been more cosmetic than substantive.</p>	10

Poor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="493 205 1284 331">1. Thesis: There is no real point to prove in the opening statement (e.g. "This exhibition will cover Egypt and Rome" vs. "This exhibition will show that the Romans adapted to Egyptian artistic traditions rather than imposing their own.")<li data-bbox="493 363 1260 489">2. Organization: The themes are very vaguely stated and there is little to no concrete evidence mentioned. The organization has not been well thought through, and so the paper tends to meander.<li data-bbox="493 520 1292 646">3. Evidence: Few written sources are cited; those that appear are often inappropriate for a research paper (general art history surveys, random internet cites instead of scholarly databases). There is little to no visual analysis.<li data-bbox="493 678 1292 804">4. Writing The writing is so poor as to be incomprehensible at times. It is vague, awkward, and irrelevant. There are many errors, and in the final draft, few revisions have improved the writing.
------	---