|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fail – (0)** | **Fail (1)** | **Fail + (2)** | **Fence (3)** | **Pass – (4)** | **Pass (5)** | **Pass + (6)** |
| **Knowledge & Recall of Texts****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | Egregious gaps in knowledge and recall. Little or no demonstrated knowledge of or familiarity with relevant texts. | Serious gaps in knowledge and recall; the answer is clearly flawed with plenty of inaccurate information. | The answer falls short. Knowledge and recall are patchy, with gaps only partly redeemed by some accurate information. | On the cusp between Pass– and Fail+. Needs to be questioned particularly carefully in oral exam. | Familiarity and recall are flawed, but not seriously so and generally in relatively minor ways. Unimpressive but acceptable. | Approximately the standard level of familiarity and recall sought; generally accurate and substantive; demonstrated by details adduced. | Excellent familiarity with the author(s) and/or text(s). A number of highly pertinent details adduced in essay. |
| **Sophistication of Analysis****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | Few signs of analysis or attempts at analysis at all. Purely superficial (e.g. reductive plot summary). | Analysis is either very superficial or simply wrong.  | The answer falls short; either the analysis is fairly superficial or flawed, or it is patchy, with parts that are acceptable and others that are not. | On the cusp between Pass– and Fail+. Needs to be questioned particularly carefully in oral exam. | Analysis and insights somewhat generalized, sketchy and/or superficial, but still most of the time broadly accurate. | Approximately the standard level of analysis looked for at M.A. or Ph.D. level. Good, solid and generally perceptive. | Highly sophisticated analysis. Considerable insight often going beyond the usual sources. Impressive thinking. |
| **Coherence of Written Answers****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | No real signs of coherence or argument at all. Paragraphs may appear to be ordered in jumbled fashion. | Little true coherence or argumentation. Little sign of logical progression. Paragraphs poorly ordered. | Argumentation is distinctly flawed, with at least a partial lack of logical progression or some wrong conclusions drawn. | On the cusp between Pass– and Fail+. Needs to be questioned particularly carefully in oral exam. | Argumentation has some flaws but is still minimally acceptable. Some parts go off in strange directions while others are more “on track.” | Essay is adequately constructed, generally cogent and well laid out, with adequate marshalling of data, secondary material, etc. | Answer is very well constructed and leads stylishly through to logical and convincing conclusions. |