

Grading Score Report

Issues

- Student12, Category 2: I'm not fully confident in the score because the student's explanation touches on relevant concepts but lacks depth, making it hard to distinguish between "ok" and "good."
- Student47, Category 4: My uncertainty comes from the fact that the student misinterprets some terminology, yet they show partial understanding. The rubric's definition of "poor" overlaps with "bad," so the boundary feels ambiguous.

Confidence Scores

	Thesis	Evidence	Organization	Mechanics
Student1	Pretty confident	Pretty confident	Pretty confident	Somewhat unsure
Student2	Pretty confident	Unsure	Somewhat unsure	Pretty confident
Student3	Confident	Pretty confident	Pretty confident	Pretty confident

Samples

- Analysis, (5) Good: "Lorem Ipsum is not simply random text" (Student12) - the student demonstrated clear reasoning by connecting historical context to the text and correctly identified Cicero's de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum as the source.
- Analysis, (3) Ok: "the text is a treatise on ethics" (Student34) - the student provided partial analysis, noting but failing to elaborate on its significance or implications.
- Analysis, (1) Poor: Student56, The student's analysis was superficial, stating only "this passage is old Latin" without any attempt to interpret meaning or relevance.
- Evidence, (5) Good: Student78, The student supported their claims with direct textual evidence: "Lorem Ipsum has roots in classical Latin literature" and tied it to Cicero's work.
- Evidence, Ok: Student91, The student referenced the text vaguely, writing "it comes from philosophy" but did not provide precise citations or examples.