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|  | **Criteria** | **Research** | **Argument introduction and conclusion** | **Analysis****body of paper** | **Clarity** | **Format** |
| **Rating** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Excellent** | -Fits perfectly well within our mission: involves a study of one or more French and Francophone women authors, the representation of women and gender in French and Francophone literatures, the role of women and people with diverse genders and identities in French and Francophone history and cultures, gender theory, and feminist literary criticism. | -a significant amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken-the majority of sources are from peer-reviewed publications- research is solidly within the parameters of the analysis and thesis argument | -an original and provocative thesis is clearly stated at the beginning of the paper-the method of proving that thesis is established early on and justified on scholarly terms-the thesis provides the backbone of analysis and reaches a satisfying conclusion based on what was proposed at the beginning | -based on excellent research and an original thesis, the analysis is strong, and clearly follows established research questions-the research is artfully woven throughout the analysis, shoring up and thoughtfully supporting the argument-new information is well contextualized and serves to propel the argument towards a satisfying conclusion | - the paper is easy to read, analysis flows well-language is sophisticated without being jargonistic-terms of analysis and argumentation are clearly laid out and well-defined | -Times New Roman 12 pt, double spaced, 1-inch margins, page numbers-a cover page provides pertinent information- bibliography follows a recognized scholarly style-citations are thorough and well documented throughout the paper |
| **Developing** |  | -a reasonable amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken-sources are mainly from peer-reviewed publications-research is sound but predictable | - an interesting but predictable thesis is clearly stated at the beginning of the paperthe thesis tends toward more description than argument, leading to a weak conclusion-the methodology is there but isn’t clearly laid out, or is laid out but not followed through on an expert level | -the analysis is good but there are some significant weaknesses or lapsesthe paper occasionally drifts off-topic or into territory that isn’t adequately supported by the research-the research questions are interesting but potentially unrealistic in terms of the type and/or level of research undertaken | -the paper is well written but suffers from some significant grammatical inconsistencies or spelling errors-language is clear but lacks scholarly depth-there are some lapses in definition and explication of terms -transitions between points in the analysis are weak | -the paper basically follows the technical requirements, with a few minor exceptions-citations are solid but not thorough, with some noticeable omissions |
| **Poor** |  | -less than the minimum amount of independent, scholarly research was undertaken-sources depend heavily on non-scholarly publications-research is weak and unoriginal, but also fails to adequately support the argument | - there is no easily identifiable thesis and/or little in the way of method-there is no conclusion because no argument was established early on | -analysis is uninteresting or uninspired, tending toward description -research questions are poorly laid out and inadequately explored-the research does not adequately support the analysis | - major problems with grammar and spelling-language is murky, confused and difficult to follow-there is a paucity of definitions or context for analysis | -there are some significant problems with the technical requirements of the paper that affect the strength of its analysis-citations are weak and/or the bibliography is incomplete |