

Sociological Imagination Paper						
Criteria	Ratings					Pts
Sociological Imagination	5.0 pts Author clearly, accurately and thoughtfully defines and discusses private troubles and public issues in their own words. Author reflects on the relationship between these terms by engaging directly with Mills' specific arguments in The Sociological Imagination (1959). At appropriate point(s) in the paper, writer demonstrates unique, insightful, reasoned reflection upon the implications of the sociological imagination for individuals, society and the social sciences.	4.0 pts Author clearly and accurately defines and discusses private troubles and public issues in their own words. Author reflects on the relationship between these terms with reference to Mills. Writer demonstrates reasoned reflection upon the implications of the sociological imagination for individuals, society and/or the social sciences.	3.0 pts Author accurately defines private troubles and public issues in their own words. Author provides some general reflection on the relationship between these terms. Writer provides a vague or unclear reflection on the implications of the sociological imagination.	2.0 pts Author defines private troubles and public issues but definition may be unclear, inaccurate or not written in their own words. Author's reflection on the sociological imagination is missing or may be rambling, imprecise or inaccurate.	1.0 pts Insufficient material to assess.	0.0 pts Please see TA.
						5.0 pts
Personal Experience	2.5 pts At an appropriate point in the paper, the author clearly and concisely summarizes key details from a relevant personal experience with useful context needed for the reader to understand. Writer briefly yet clearly explains why they selected this experience for this paper.	2.0 pts Author clearly describes most key details from a relevant personal experience with appropriate context. Writer may or may not fully explain why this is an appropriate experience to discuss in this paper.	1.5 pts Author describes details from a personal experience. The description may be unclear, rambling or lacking in context.	1.0 pts Author alludes to a personal experience but some details are missing. The relevance of this experience for the paper is not established.	0.5 pts Insufficient material to assess.	0.0 pts Please see TA.
						2.5 pts