

03/11

Performance Indicators	Outstanding	Good	Competent	Needs Revision
Viewpoint: Thesis/Claim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has sharply defined, compelling organizing idea, thesis or question. Clear introduction presents thesis in a highly engaging, compelling manner. Coherent, complex, sophisticated argument supports organizing idea/thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has clearly defined organizing idea, thesis or question. Clear introduction presents thesis in an engaging manner. Coherent, sometimes complex arguments support organizing idea/thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing thesis, idea or question is comprehensible but not especially clear. Introduction presents thesis in a mostly comprehensible manner. Coherent but rarely complex or sophisticated arguments support organizing idea/thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing idea, thesis, or question is not clear. Introduction and the thesis it contains are not clear. Arguments lack coherence and/or clarity.
Evidence and Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting arguments include specific, relevant, accurate and verifiable, and highly persuasive evidence, drawn from both primary and secondary sources. Uses quotations and paraphrasing appropriately to sustain an argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting arguments include relevant, accurate and verifiable, and mostly persuasive evidence, drawn from both primary and secondary source. Uses quotations and paraphrasing appropriately to sustain an argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence for supporting arguments is accurate and verifiable, mostly specific and persuasive. Use of quotations and paraphrasing is mostly evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting arguments may include inaccurate evidence and lack clear, persuasive, or relevant evidence. Quotations and paraphrasing do not effectively support arguments.
Analysis and Persuasion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argument draws on, explains, and critiques evidence from alternative points of view. Clearly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly explains and analyzes the connection between all evidence and argument being made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argument draws on evidence from alternative points of view. Mostly clear and thoughtful explanation or analysis of how the evidence presented supports each argument. Counter-evidence may be introduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some alternative arguments are presented but not always well integrated. Some explanation of how the evidence presented supports each argument, but the explanations are not always clear and thorough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supporting alternative arguments is either missing or poorly integrated. No explanation or analysis of how or why the evidence supports each argument.
Effective Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each argument clearly flows in support of an overall structure. Consistent, effective transitions develop ideas and arguments logically & build to a compelling, persuasive conclusion. Distinct conclusion synthesizes arguments that support idea/general thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each argument presented supports an overall structure. Usually uses effective transitions to connect ideas and arguments, leading to a persuasive conclusion. Distinct conclusion partly synthesizes, but mostly re-presents the major arguments to support idea/general thesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most arguments presented clearly support the overall structure. Transitions are sometimes abrupt but the arguments and conclusion mostly connect. Conclusion represents major arguments and connects them to thesis; some synthesis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arguments presented are not clearly or supportively connected to the overall structure. Transitions between arguments are largely unclear. Conclusion is either vague or unclear and poorly connected to the paper's major arguments.

Performance Indicators	Outstanding	Good	Competent	Needs Revision
Understanding of Implications and Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a highly informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper. ▪ Broader implications of the central arguments are presented and thoroughly explored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a somewhat informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper. ▪ Some broader implication of the central argument is presented and explored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a very general, somewhat less informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper ▪ The broader implications of the central argument are alluded to but not necessarily explored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arguments, ideas and voice reflect almost no awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding the questions addressed in the paper. ▪ The broader implications of the central argument are neither presented nor explored.
Strong, Engaged Student Voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confident, highly fluid writing style; lively, engaging, articulate language. Paper has distinct, individual voice that serves to develop and further the argument throughout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confident writing style; engaging, mostly articulate language. Paper has an individual voice that manifests itself at important points in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engaged but somewhat tentative or basic writing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Awkward, wooden, or confusing writing style: student voice is buried at best.
Conventions (for writing task only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grammar and punctuation nearly flawless. ▪ Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grammar and punctuation mostly correct. ▪ Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grammar and punctuation sometimes flawed, but not in a manner that undermines the clarity of the paper's ideas. ▪ Accessible, complete but somewhat imprecise bibliography and citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consistently defective grammar and punctuation. ▪ Inappropriate and/or mistaken documentation of sources (poorly organized, incomplete bibliography and citations).
Presentation (for oral component only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicates clear understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, consistently sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work. ▪ Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper. ▪ Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate. Presents relevant evidence that may not have appeared in the paper. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicates clear understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, sometimes sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work. ▪ Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper. ▪ Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicates a mostly clear and basic understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful though not necessarily sophisticated manner. ▪ Presentation and response to questions may not fully reflect the coherence and depth of the paper, but they are nevertheless clear and thoughtful. ▪ Answers to questions are mostly accurate, thoughtful, and effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fails to communicate a clear and basic understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful manner. ▪ Presentation and response to questions reflects the incoherence and general weakness of the paper. ▪ Answers questions superficially, inappropriately, or incorrectly.