Title of Paper:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent - 4** | **Strong - 3** | **Satisfactory - 2** | **Weak - 1** |
| Content  40% of overall score | Offers nuanced and innovative insights between folklore and science; accurately explains and applies folkloristic and scientific concepts | Convincingly integrates scholarship and data about folklore and science; accurately applies relevant concepts from both domains | Clearly addresses both folklore and science; application of concepts in one or both disciplines may be confusing | Shows only superficial knowledge of one or both disciplines; inaccurate application of concepts |
| Argument  40% of overall score | Strongly supportive details; accurate, relevant, balanced, and precise use of evidence; logically developed; primarily analytical; shows a command of foundational literature in folklore and science | Supportive details; accurate and relevant evidence; logically developed; balances description and analysis; incorporates foundational literature in folklore and science | Sufficient details; relevant evidence; may exhibit argumentative weaknesses or rely too much on description; may miss important literature in either folklore or science | Lacks sufficient support, contains trivial or irrelevant points/evidence; exhibits flaws in logic/organization; lacks grounding in history of ideas |
| Organization 10% of overall score | Clear purpose; compelling intro; nuanced and arguable thesis; relevant topic sentences; thoughtful conclusion | Strong intro; clear thesis that predicts evidence to follow; transitional topic sentences; effective conclusion | Vague thesis; main idea, intro, and conclusion all work together; organization may need tightening | Omits one or more of the following: clear purpose, intro, thesis, conclusion |
| Style  10% of overall score | Compelling sentence and paragraph variety; free of unnecessary jargon and/or summary; sophisticated awareness of differences between folklore and science audiences | Adequate sentence and paragraph variety; may rely on unnecessary jargon and/or summary; adequate awareness of differences between folklore and science audiences | Inconsistent, disruptive sentence and paragraph variety; frequently relies on unnecessary jargon and/or summary; lacks awareness of differences between folklore and science audiences | Lacks adequate sentence and paragraph variety; relies too heavily on unnecessary jargon and/or summary; unaware of differences between folklore and science audiences |

**COMMENTS:**