

Please circle EACH topic (bullet point) that applies to the entered project!

Category / Trait	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Investigation</b>  <i>How complex and original is the presented information? How effective is the supporting information? The methodology used?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper covers an easy to research topic.</li> <li>Evidence is sparse, with an unconvincing argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper covers an easy to research topic.</li> <li>Evidence is somewhat reliable but lacks coherence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper shows some complexity, deals with a slightly difficult topic or barrier.</li> <li>Evidence is reliable, attempts to connect multiple ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper shows moderate complexity.</li> <li>Evidence starts to build a coherent body of evidence; conjectures are mostly supported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper shows a high level of complexity, and deals with moderately difficult topics / barriers.</li> <li>Solid body of evidence, connected by good logic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper shows a high level of complexity, dealing with difficult barriers, adding original sources.</li> <li>Solid body of evidence, connected by a solid chain of excellent logic.</li> </ul>
<b>Research</b>  <i>How is the information supported with examples and (new to the subject) data? Is it placed in historical context?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper rephrases research completed by others.</li> <li>Paper gives minimal historical / cultural context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper mostly rephrases, with some new analysis pulled from others' research.</li> <li>Inconsistent historical context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is a meta analysis of many previous research materials to determine new analysis of the topic.</li> <li>A good attempt at historical context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper uses some firsthand knowledge, as well as incorporating work of others.</li> <li>Historical context is correct, but might be brief.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An actual, first hand investigation, supported by relevant research.</li> <li>Paper does a good job at placing topic in historical / cultural context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A first hand investigation into an unusual subject, adding original research and/or sources.</li> <li>Paper clearly places topic in historical context in detail.</li> </ul>
<b>Historical accuracy</b>  <i>How familiar is the author with relevant scholarship and makes critical assessment of the authority &amp; significance of the sources used?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is somewhat pre-1650 appropriate.</li> <li>Sources are nearly all indirect and it is unclear if the author is familiar with relevant scholarship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is somewhat pre-1650 appropriate.</li> <li>Sources are nearly all indirect; quality of sources is limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is mostly pre-1650 appropriate.</li> <li>The sources are a mix of indirect and scholarly; quality of sources is variable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is pre-1600 appropriate.</li> <li>The sources are mostly direct and scholarly, with an occasional indirect source; quality of sources is generally good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is pre-1600 appropriate.</li> <li>A good mix of direct and scholarly sources; quality of sources is good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The topic is perfectly pre-1600 appropriate</li> <li>Great mix of direct and scholarly sources, might include unique or original research.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of Technique</b>  <i>Is the paper written in a clear and articulate manner? Does it have a logical format, an effective layout, a clear and consistent citation system?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper is difficult to follow, with unexplained quotes.</li> <li>Minimal attempt at formatting, with poor citation and no bibliography.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is somewhat difficult to follow.</li> <li>Minimal formatting, inconsistent citation and an incomplete bibliography.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is somewhat easy to read and understand.</li> <li>Spotty formatting, cites most sources with a limited bibliography</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is readable, incorporates translations / quotes as needed.</li> <li>Adequate formatting and citation, bibl. might include hyperlinks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is easy to read, incorporates translation /quotes.</li> <li>Overall good balance of text and images; consistent citations, bibl. includes links and illustration sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fascinating read, incorporates translation /quotes seamlessly; format is carefully thought out and enhances understanding.</li> <li>Bibliography perhaps annotated.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of Writing</b>  <i>Is the information organized logically? Does the author clarify and elaborate the main topic or theory, and establishes it in context of other related topics / theories?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is unclear, with a minimal attempt at coherence / articulation of ideas.</li> <li>Paper has little exploration of the main topic, and does not establish it within a broader context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is hard to read, only parts are coherent and articulate - has no introduction.</li> <li>Paper elaborates on the main topic in an unclear way.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is mostly coherent and articulate - includes some sort of introduction.</li> <li>Some aspects of topic explored, discusses some related topics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nearly all of the paper is coherent and articulate - adequate first impression (intro).</li> <li>Many aspects of topic explored, discusses related topics / theories.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper is easy to read and understand, it is coherent and articulate - quite engaging first impression.</li> <li>Provides some significant detail, discusses most important related topics / theories.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very clearly written and highly articulate, with a great first impression; the reader wants to read more.</li> <li>Provides extensive detail, extensively discusses multiple related topics.</li> </ul>