

**GRADING RUBRIC**

	<b>A: Excellent</b>	<b>B: Good</b>	<b>C: Adequate</b>	<b>D: Not Adequate</b>	<b>F: Fails</b>
<b>Critical Thinking:</b>	The paper coheres around an original and insightful argument that is substantive, contestable, and specific. The paper makes the reader think about something in a new and interesting way.	The paper coheres around an argument that is substantive, contestable, specific, and original.	The paper coheres around an argument that is adequately substantive, contestable, and specific.	The paper does not make an argument but is merely a collection of observations.	The paper fails to make an argument.
<b>Reading Comprehension and Application</b>	The paper makes an interesting and thoughtful contribution to one or more of the debates in film/media studies. Sources are properly cited.	The paper engages with film/media studies texts and reflects a solid understanding of their central arguments. Sources are properly cited.	The paper engages with film/media studies texts but has a tendency to draw on minor points or supporting evidence rather than addressing the central arguments. Sources are properly cited.	The paper cherry picks phrases from film/media studies texts rather than really engaging with them <i>or</i> references to the readings suggest that the author did not understand them.	The paper does not address the course readings.
<b>Textual Analysis</b>	The paper uses well chosen examples from the films/media texts and provides <i>analytical</i> descriptions of <i>specific</i> shots, sequences, and narrative elements in support of its argument. The analysis brings fresh insights to the film or media text.	The paper uses well chosen examples from the film/media texts and provides <i>analytical</i> descriptions of <i>specific</i> shots, sequences, and narrative elements in support of its argument. The analysis has grown out of repeated viewings of the film/media text.	The paper analyzes the film/media text to support an argument but tends towards vague generalizations rather than vivid evocations of specific elements of the films/media texts and/or the analysis reflects a superficial understanding of the film/media text.	The paper describes the film/media text rather than analyzing it in support of an argument.	The paper does not demonstrate a basic understanding of the film/media text discussed.
<b>Writing</b>	The language is eloquent and sophisticated, with words chosen for their precise meanings; each paragraph develops a single idea (stated in the topic sentence) that provides strong support for the paper’s argument; the paper’s organization is clear and serves the argument well.	The language is correct with words chosen for their precise meanings; each paragraph develops a single idea, though the sub-claims could be more forcefully stated in topic sentences; the paper is well organized but could use more ‘signposts’ to guide the reader from one idea to the next.	The language is correct but unsophisticated; each paragraph develops a single idea, but that idea is not clearly identified in a topic sentence; the organization is not ideally suited to the argument.	Errors in grammar and vocabulary obscure the author’s meaning <i>or</i> paragraphs develop more than one idea <i>or</i> there is little logic to the organization.	The paper does not demonstrate fluency in English.