

8-9	The most sophisticated responses will demonstrate a scholarly understanding of the complexities of the literature by addressing both the original texts and the criticism. The guests speak with sophistication about the texts and the criticism, all the while maintaining an appropriate and engaging voice. These responses select from the texts and the criticism the most appropriate and meaningful passages and cite correctly. At minimum, one direct quote is used from each text and from each critical essay. Three different critical essays are represented both in the dialogue and in the works cited. Additionally, responses illustrate a carefully considered guest list; each guest should have something to offer to the other guests. While not flawless, these responses demonstrate an understanding of the task as well as consistent control over the elements of effective composition and a mature command of effective prose. These writers read with insight and express their ideas with skill and clarity. The 9 responses may be especially precise in the diction used in literary analysis. These responses meet the guidelines for length and formatting.	9 = 98 8+ = 95 8- = 92
6-7	The content of these responses resembles that of higher scoring essays, but is less precise and less aptly supported. These responses deal with literary analysis and criticism, but are less effective than the upper range essays. These responses demonstrate the writer's ability to express ideas clearly, but they do so with less maturity and precision than the best responses. These responses may be somewhat less consistent in dealing with the voices of the guests. Generally, 7 papers present a more developed analysis and a more consistent command of the elements of effective college-level composition, especially voice, than do essays scored 6. As with the 9 responses, one direct quote is used from each text and from each critical essay. Three different critical essays are represented both in the dialogue and in the works cited. Finally, these responses meet the guidelines for length and formatting.	7+ = 90 7 = 88 6+ = 85 6 = 82
5	These responses are typically superficial. The writing is, as a rule, less clear and well organized than that of the upper-half responses, and the thinking is often simplistic. These responses may have more obvious inconsistencies in voice: guests may speak, at times, in ways inconsistent with their characterization. Although not seriously in error about the content and literary techniques of the texts or criticism, they miss the complexity of the piece and offer only a perfunctory analysis. The treatment of the texts/ criticism is overly generalized or mechanical. The writing adequately conveys the writer's thoughts, but the responses themselves are commonplace. The examples used are usually simple and obvious. As with the above responses, one direct quote is used from each text and from each critical essay. Three different critical essays are represented both in the dialogue and in the works cited. Finally, these responses meet the guidelines for length and formatting.	5+ = 80 5 = 78
3-4	These essays reflect an incomplete understanding of the texts or criticism and do not completely respond to the question. The discussion is unclear or simply misses the point. The treatment of literary concepts is scanty or unconvincing with little support drawn from the passage. Typically, these responses reveal marked weaknesses in the writer's ability to handle the mechanics of written English. These lower-half papers address the task but reflect an incomplete or oversimplified understanding of the selections. The discussion may be inaccurate, unclear, misguided, or undeveloped. These responses may paraphrase rather than analyze. The analysis will likely be meager and unconvincing; the responses typically lack persuasive reference to the text, and the guests speak in uncharacteristic ways. Generally the writing demonstrates limited control of diction, organization, syntax, or grammar. Lower range responses may be missing evidence of critical research or inappropriate critical research.	4+ = 75 4 = 72 3+ = 68 3 = 65
2-1	These essays compound the weaknesses of the papers in the 3-4 range. They may seriously misunderstand the literary selections or fail to answer the question. Frequently, they are unacceptably brief. Often poorly written on several counts, they may contain many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics. Although some attempt may have been made to answer the question, the writer's views typically are presented with little clarity, organization, coherence, or supporting evidence. Responses that are especially inexact, vacuous, and/or mechanically unsound should be scored 1.	2+ = 60 2 = 55 1 = 50
0	This is a response with no more than a reference to the task. This is a blank paper or a response that makes no attempt to address the question. This would also include a response that is completely illegible.	