|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceeds Standard** | **Meets Standard** | **Approaches Standard** | **Needs Significant Improvement** |
| **Organization****/10** | Well organized & clearly focused, demonstrating clear coherence & smooth progression of ideas Engaging introduction & conclusion | Generally organized & focused, showing some coherence of ideasEffective introduction & conclusion | Limited in its organization, & demonstrates lapses in coherenceIntroduction and/or conclusion present but ineffective | Poorly organized, & has serious problems with coherenceIntroduction and/or conclusion not present |
| **Structural Elements****/10** | Thesis takes an insightful, arguable position that effectively synthesizes sources’ main ideas regarding reform.Body thesis & concluding sentences effectively emphasize thesis | Thesis takes a specific, arguable position on the sources’ main ideas, but lack insight or comprehensive understanding. Body thesis & concluding sentences relate to thesis | Thesis takes a vague and unoriginal position on the sources’ main ideas, and/or fail to reveal understanding of the sources.Body thesis & concluding sentences are present | Thesis is absent or does not adequately address the prompt and/or the sources’ main ideas.Body thesis & concluding sentences absent or unrelated to thesis |
| **Use of Evidence** **/22** | Clearly appropriate, compelling evidence supports the thesisQuotes are fluidly integrated throughout analysisVaried sources are woven together throughout all body paragraphs | Adequate evidence supports the thesisQuotes are integrated throughout analysis Varied sources are used, and synthesized in most paragraphs | Inconsistent/general evidence does not fully support thesis Quotes are not integrated consistentlyMinimum number of sources are used, but rarely synthesized | Evidence does not support the thesis, or it is absentQuotes are not integratedMinimum number of sources are not used, or no synthesis is present  |
| **Quality of Analysis****/22** | Analysis is insightful, and explains how evidence supports thesisReflects a complex understanding of the sources  | Analysis explains how evidence supports thesisReflects an adequate understanding of the sources | Analysis explains the evidence but not how it supports the thesis, or some analysis is summaryReflects little understanding of sources, or misinterprets some  | Analysis does not support the thesis or does not fit the evidence, and/or is all summaryMisinterprets most sources |
| **Conventions & Style****/6** | Free of most errors in grammar, usage & mechanics Exhibits skillful use of language with varied, accurate dictionTransitions are seamless  | Generally free of errors in grammar, usage & mechanicsExhibits adequate use of language with generally appropriate dictionTransitions used appropriately  | Has multiple errors in grammar, usage & mechanicsAt times, presents inappropriate or incorrect dictionTransitions are awkward/repetitive | Errors in grammar, usage & mechanics interfere with understandingPresents incorrect language choices that distract readerTransitions absent  |
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