

BISLA Criteria for Evaluating Written Work

	A Excellent (100 – 93)	B very good (92 – 84)	C average (83 – 74)	D satisfactory (73-63)	E sufficient (62 – 51)	F(x) fail (50 – 0)
Ideas	Answers the given topic question and thesis. Course and other material well covered. Concepts defined. Fairness to cited authors' ideas, ability to follow logic and seek motivation behind arguments. Stands above the rest of the papers, original.	Answers the given topic and stated thesis. Covers and defines all the main concepts, works with course readings. Able to identify points not covered or missing.	Competent discussion of major points, relevant to topic. Concepts defined.	Suggests some confusion about material. Some relevant points missing; not well connected to the assigned topic.	Poor coverage of concepts, little relevance to the assigned topic.	Plagiarism Not reflecting the assigned topic Misunderstanding of concepts
Argumentation	Strong argument presented throughout. Statements supported with evidence, arguments evaluated. Conclusion follows series of arguments. Surprising, innovative, creative thinking. Sources thoroughly cited in APA format.	Clearly explains and evaluates relevant arguments and reasons for such evaluation. Statements are supported. Critical thinking. Coherent. Sources attributed and cited.	Decent effort to engage in analysis. Relying more on description or not supporting statements well. Arguments scattered. Uses few sources. Sources are cited.	Displays some effort of argumentation. Arguments not supported or missing, heavy use of description. Lacking or incorrect citations	Little to no original analysis, largely descriptive or resorting to rants. Sources poorly attributed.	Compilation of secondary sources without original critical analysis. No effort made. Sources not attributed.
Organization	Well organized and laid out. Thesis clearly stated in the first paragraph. Moves in a logical line towards proving/disproving hypotheses and answering research questions.	Neat organization, sections following in a logical sequence. Correct grammar and spelling, good layout and appearance.	Follows a basic structure. Some spelling mistakes and typos.	Organization needs tightening up. Overlooks grammatical mistakes.	Disorganized, proceeds in haphazard manner. Serious grammatical or spelling errors. Lacking structure and layout.	Disorganized, feel of 'last minute' work.
Voice	Creativity. Voice of the author stands out. Appealing. Demonstrates wide vocabulary and ability to weave components together in one thread. Knowledge of the value of words, careful work with meanings. Well written, unique.	Creative, fluent narrative. Sense of individual voice. Use of academic language.	Personality of the author discernible at times. Vocabulary limited, language at times inappropriate.	Little original input, clashing styles or approaches. Using slang, relying on strong language or heavy quotes from other sources.	Absent. Little or no effort to bring in personal voice. Use of slang or expletives to cover the lack of original thought.	Absent.