

June, 2009 Writing Rubric/HISTORY OF ART AND ARCHITECTURE

<p>Formal and Stylistic Analysis</p>	<p>Formal description of the works of art/architecture is detailed, sensitive, well-organized, helping the reader “see” the work. Extends beyond observation into analysis of the style of the work(s). Supports attribution to a particular historical style with useful references to specific formal details.</p>	<p>Formal description of the works of art/architecture is detailed, well-organized. Extends beyond observation into often thoughtful analysis of the style of the work(s), but attribution is general, and not convincingly supported with references to specific formal details.</p>	<p>Formal description of the works of art/architecture provides basic, detailed information about what is seen. Descriptive terminology is occasionally perceptive. Includes some analysis or understanding of the representative style of the artwork(s) but does not successfully integrate the stylistic attribution with specific formal details.</p>	<p>Formal description of the works of art/architecture provides basic information about what is seen. Descriptive terminology is vague. Includes little to no analysis or understanding of the representative style of the artwork(s). Responses to artwork reliant upon personal reactions and value judgments.</p>
<p>Critical Perspective and Theoretical Approach</p>	<p>Questions about the interpretation and significance of the works of art/architecture are elegantly articulated. Clear statement of compelling thesis. Appropriate and original critical perspective or theories employed to analyze and understand specific works of art/architecture.</p>	<p>Questions about the interpretation and significance of the works of art/architecture are clearly articulated, with a solid statement of worthwhile and interesting thesis. Appropriate critical perspective or theories usefully employed to analyze and understand specific works of art/architecture.</p>	<p>Some attempt at questioning and interpretation employed to understand works of art/architecture, but not very insightful. Thesis is basic; does not pose significant questions. Conclusion summarizes and restates the formal and stylistic observations with rudimentary acknowledgment of critical perspective.</p>	<p>No particular questioning or critical perspective employed to understand works. No thesis. Statement of the obvious; observation rather than analysis. Conclusion is self-evident, and merely summarizes and restates the formal and stylistic observation.</p>

<p>Establishing Socio-Historical Context</p>	<p>Research is highly focused. Uses specific works of art and other appropriate historical sources to help elucidate and explain the social and historical context of the specific artworks. Uses artworks and other primary sources in a sophisticated manner. Understands how to integrate a variety of sources into the overall thesis and to support argument.</p>	<p>Research is relatively focused but strays into generalities. Uses artworks as primary documentation and refers to other appropriate historical sources to help elucidate and explain the social and historical context of the specific artworks. Attempts to integrate other sources into the overall thesis and to support argument.</p>	<p>Overly broad explanation of socio-historical context. Establishment of context is basic or underdeveloped; mostly reliant upon secondary sources. Artworks used mostly as illustrations and not as primary documents. Sources are adequate, but do not extend beyond obvious.</p>	<p>Artworks plugged into broad, general socio-historical context. Artworks used as illustrations and not as primary documents. Does not see the trees for the forest. Relies upon secondary sources. Sources are minimal and hastily assembled.</p>
<p>Inclusion of supporting visual evidence (plates and figures) and documentation</p>	<p>Specific details (date/historical period, location, materials, dimensions) of art/architecture included in reproductions that are clearly labeled, with sources of images included in caption for short papers and list of illustrations for longer papers. Reference to reproductions consistently referred to in text (i.e., fig, #, pl. #). Quotations used appropriately and minimally; intelligent</p>	<p>Reproductions included with some labeling, but incomplete or missing details and sources of images. Reference to reproductions consistently referred to in text (i.e., fig, #, pl. #). Overreliance on quotations that could be paraphrased. Citations and sources included, but inconsistently or with incorrect format.</p>	<p>Reproductions included with minimal or no labeling. Reference to reproductions incorrectly or haphazardly referred to in text (i.e., fig, #, pl. #). Quotations, citations and sources used incorrectly and inconsistently.</p>	<p>No reproductions included. Citations and sources missing or used incorrectly and inconsistently.</p>

paraphrasing preferred. All sources appropriately acknowledged. Chicago Manual of Style Humanities citation preferred, correctly and consistently employed.

Student # _____ Paper Date/ Assignment _____
Date Reviewed _____ Reviewed by _____