|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 ideas  Effective introduction & conclusion | | Limited in its organization, & demonstrates lapses in coherence  Introduction and/or conclusion present but ineffective | Poorly organized, & has serious problems with coherence  Introduction 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 thesis  Quotes are fluidly integrated throughout analysis  Varied sources are woven together throughout all body paragraphs | Adequate evidence supports the thesis  Quotes 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  consistently  Minimum number of sources are used, but rarely synthesized | Evidence does not support  the thesis, or it is absent  Quotes are not integrated  Minimum number of sources are not used, or no synthesis is present |
| **Quality of Analysis**  **/22** | | Analysis is insightful, and explains how evidence supports thesis  Reflects a complex understanding of the sources | Analysis explains how evidence supports thesis  Reflects an adequate understanding of the sources | | Analysis explains the evidence but not how it supports the thesis, or some analysis is summary  Reflects little understanding of sources, or misinterprets some | Analysis does not support the  thesis or does not fit the evidence, and/or is all summary  Misinterprets most sources |
| **Conventions & Style**  **/6** | | Free of most errors in grammar, usage & mechanics  Exhibits skillful use of language with varied, accurate diction  Transitions are seamless | Generally free of errors in  grammar, usage & mechanics  Exhibits adequate use of language with generally appropriate diction  Transitions used appropriately | | Has multiple errors in  grammar, usage & mechanics  At times, presents inappropriate or incorrect diction  Transitions are awkward/repetitive | Errors in grammar, usage & mechanics interfere with understanding  Presents incorrect language  choices that distract reader  Transitions absent |

**Name Period**

**ESSAY TOTAL:**  /70 **MLA Formatting:** Appearance In-Text Citations Works Cited

*Sources Cited: Baradaran Lichtblau Vanden Heuvel, “Healing” Vanden Heuvel, “National” Weinstein, “Justice” Weinstein, “Texas”*