

CRITERIA FOR EXEGESIS PAPER ASSESSMENT

COMPILED BY JAN A. SIGVARTSEN & LEANNE M. SIGVARTSEN

Elements	A Range	B Range	C Range	D Range	F – Fail
<i>Title and Paper Presentation</i>	The title is creative, succinct, one that also hints at the scope, method and argument of the paper. The appearance and word-processing of the document is of a high professional standard.	The title is succinct and hints at the scope, method and argument of the paper. The appearance and word-processing of the document is of professional standard.	Contains elements of the topic, scope and purpose of the paper. The appearance and word-processing of the document is adequately presented, but lacks a professional standard.	Describes little about the content. The appearance and word-processing in the document is poor.	Does not describe the content. The appearance of the word-processing in the document is very poor and demonstrates a lack of commitment to the professional standards required of Masters recipients.
<i>Introduction and Thesis</i>	Presents the topic and purpose of the paper very clearly and succinctly. It is objective and demonstrates a high level of critical scholarship.	Presents the topic and purpose of the paper clearly and succinctly. It is objective and demonstrates critical scholarship.	The topic and purpose lacks some clarity. It tends to be overly wordy. Critical scholarship is lacking in some places.	The topic and purpose has limited clarity. It is not easily apparent what this paper is about. Critical scholarship is lacking in some places.	The topic is not clearly described nor is the purpose of the paper expressed. Critical scholarship is nonexistent.
<i>Development</i>	Your thesis is succinct, insightful, sophisticated, even exciting. It demonstrates independent insight and comprehensive reading and research of the topic. All ideas in the paper flow logically; your argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. You have excellent transitions. Your paragraphs have solid topics and each sentence clearly relates to that topic.	Your thesis is clear, insightful and demonstrates extensive reading and research of the topic. All ideas in the paper flow logically. Your argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. You have very good transitions. Your paragraphs have solid topics and each sentence clearly relates to that topic.	Your thesis is unclear at times, your references to scholarly literature is limited or, are irrelevant. Not all ideas in the paper flow logically, some are unsound. Your argument is difficult to identify at times. Your transitions require improvement. Your paragraphs have topics but often deviate from them.	Your thesis is frequently unclear, your references to scholarly literature is very limited or, is irrelevant. Ideas in the paper flow illogically. Your argument is very difficult to identify at times. Your transitions require significant improvement. Paragraphs do not stay on topic.	Your thesis is unclear, your references to scholarly literature is nonexistent or is irrelevant. Ideas in the paper flow illogically. Your argument cannot be identified. Your transitions require significant improvement. Paragraphs do not stay on topic.

<i>Analysis</i>	Supports every point with examples from a wide range of academic literature. Quoted material is expertly integrated into the body of your work. Your analysis suggests new ways to perceive the material or identifies gaps or shortcomings in the literature.	Supports every point with examples from a wide range of academic literature. Quoted material is well integrated into the body of work.	Does not support every point with examples from academic literature. Uses only old or out of date sources. Quoted material is sometimes irrelevant or poorly integrated into the body of work.	Points are not supported by academic literature. Uses non-scholarly sources or old, out of date sources. Quoted material is often irrelevant or poorly integrated into the body of work.	Does not support any point with examples from academic literature. Uses only non-scholarly sources. Quoted material is often irrelevant or poorly integrated into the body of work.
<i>Communication and Language</i>	Is very interesting, thought provoking and exciting to read. Uses language appropriately and articulately. No more than one spelling, grammatical or style mistake per page.	Is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Uses language appropriately and articulately. No more than two spelling, grammatical or style mistakes per page.	Paper is generally well written, but sometimes lacks purpose or relevance to the topic. Has up to four spelling, grammatical and style mistakes on every page.	Paper is generally well written, but often lacks purpose or relevance to the topic. Reader is easily distracted. Has up to 10 spelling, grammatical and style mistakes on every page.	Paper is poorly written, lacks purpose or relevance to the topic. Has multiple spelling, grammatical and style mistakes on every page.
<i>Conclusion</i>	Your conclusion is succinct and very persuasive. It is strongly evidence based, and your inference very sound.	Your conclusion is persuasive. It is evidence based and your inference is sound.	Your conclusion may have some merit but some of your evidence is weak or inference is questionable.	Your conclusion is not very persuasive. Your evidence is very weak and your inference very questionable.	Your conclusion is not persuasive at all. Your evidence is scant or non-existent. Your inference is highly questionable.
<i>Referencing/ Bibliography</i>	Perfectly adheres to SBL or Turabian Style (or <i>Andrews University Standards for Written Work</i>). No mistakes are permitted	Adheres to SBL or Turabian Style (or <i>Andrews University Standards for Written Work</i>). No more than three mistakes permitted.	Often adheres to SBL or Turabian Style (or <i>Andrews University Standards for Written Work</i>). No more than 7 mistakes permitted.	Seldom adheres to SBL or Turabian Style (or <i>Andrews University Standards for Written Work</i>). No more than 10 mistakes permitted.	Does not adhere to SBL or Turabian Style (or <i>Andrews University Standards for Written Work</i>).

DOCUMENTS USED TO SOURCE CRITERIA:

Derek Bok Centre for Learning for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University.
<http://sites.harvard.edu/fs/html/icb.topic58474/GradingPapers.html>

Nancy Langston and Steve Kantowitz from the University of Wisconsin "Writing Across the Curriculum".
http://mendota.english.wisc.edu/~WAC/page.jsp?id=101&c_type=article&c_id=4

Chris Mayda from the Eastern Michigan University, "Grading Criteria". <http://www.emich.edu/public/geo/geography/Mayda/gradcriteria.htm>