Annotation Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Excellent: 90-100** | **Good: 80-89** | **Satisfactory: 70-79** | **Poor: Below 70** |
| ***Number and variety of notations (thoroughness)*** | Exhaustive notations cover the page and every aspect of the work from author’s content to language used. | Multiple notations on each and every page cover many aspects of the work from author to diction. A few aspects are not considered. | A number of notations appear on each page although the notations may be of the same aspect and particular aspects are unmentioned. | Few notations on some or all pages. Multiple aspects of the work are ignored. |
| ***Intellectual curiosity displayed in the notations and questions raised*** | Notations and questions are singularly apt, impressively arresting, and intellectually stimulating for discussion points. | Notations and questions are appropriate and should allow the discussion to be elevated from the obvious. | Notations and questions are routine but appropriate for discussion. | Notations and questions are lacking in substance and intellectual rigor. Surface level of discussion likely with such questions. |
| ***Accuracy, clarity, and grammatical correctness of notations*** | Virtually no language errors in notations; notations are all accurate and clearly articulated. | Few language errors in notations; notations are largely accurate and clearly written. | Multiple, minor language errors; notations contain minor inaccuracies and may be somewhat confusingly written. | Multiple, major language errors; notations contain numerous inaccuracies. |
| ***Commentary on significance of word choice (diction)*** | Thorough consideration of author’s or poet’s word choice is evident on each page of the annotation. | Some consideration for author’s word choice is evident in notations on every page of the annotation. | Word choice notations are made but randomly and inconsistently (several on one page and few or none on other pages). | Scant commentary on word choice is evidenced in the annotation. |
| ***Themes, motifs, figurative language, and tone of the work identified*** | All important aspects of the work are identified through annotation. | Nearly all aspects of the work are identified through annotation. | Some important aspects of the work are identified through annotation. | Few aspects of the work are identified, or correctly identified, through annotation. |
| **Use of Quotations**  | This paper makes excellent use of quotations as textual evidence. The critical analysis is seamlessly integrated in support of the task and overall argument.  | This paper smoothly integrates quotations and analysis in support of the paper's thesis. Additional textual evidence and analysis would add to the overall argument.  | This paper makes satisfactory use of quotations as textual evidence, but additional critical analysis, connecting the evidence to the task is needed.  | This paper either makes use of too many quotations without fully explaining and analyzing them or does not include enough quotations as textual evidence.  |
| **MLA Style**  | The paper uses proper citations and cites correctly with no errors when outside sources are used. Paper uses all MLA layout conventions correctly.  | The paper uses proper citations and cites correctly with only a few minor errors. Some layout errors.  | The paper uses proper citations sporadically.Many layout errors | The paper does not use proper citations consistently or cites incorrectly or uses wrong layout. |
| **Connections to *Lord of the Flies*** | This response contains several appropriate, insightful connections between the poem and LOTF.  | This response contains some good, appropriate connections between the poem and LOTF, though may be lacking in depth. | This response contains minimal appropriate connections between the poem and LOTF; explanation of connections may be too basic or undeveloped. | This response contains virtually no appropriate connections between the poem and LOTF; connections may be incorrect and/or very superficial. |

General Comments:

Score: