

**Position Paper Rubric:** revised Aug/21

**Name:**

**Mark:**

		Analysis of Source		Argumentation		Evidence		Communication
		-critically analyzes the source -demonstrates an understanding of the source and its relationship to a perspective on (globalization/nationalism/ideology)		-establishes a position -develops arguments based on logic and reason -establishes a <b>relationship</b> between position taken, argumentation, and the sources perspective		-is relevant and accurate -reflects depth and/or breadth of social studies knowledge -evidence may be theoretical, historical, contemporary, and/or current events.		-fluency and essay organization -syntax, mechanics, and grammar -use of vocabulary and social studies terminology
<b>Mastery</b> <b>4+</b> <b>4</b> <b>4-</b>	6 5.5	The understanding of the source is insightful and sophisticated. A perceptive discussion of the source and its relationship(s) to the perspective(s) is/are comprehensively developed.	8 7.6 7.2	Convincingly established position with judiciously chosen, consistent and compelling argumentation. The relationship between (see above) is perceptively developed and demonstrates insightful understanding of the assignment. .	8 7.6 7.2	Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive. A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social and application to the assignment.	8 7.6 7.2	The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated. Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive.
<b>Proficient</b> <b>3+</b> <b>3</b> <b>3-</b>	5.2 5 4.8	The understanding of the source is sound and adept. A purposeful discussion of the source and its relationship(s) to perspective(s) is/are capably developed.	7 6.7 6.4	Purposely chosen position with logical and capably developed argumentation. The relationship between (see above) is clearly developed and demonstrates sound understanding of the assignment.	7 6.7 6.4	Evidence is purposeful and specific. Evidence may contain some minor errors. A capable discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social and application to the assignment.	7 6.7 6.4	The writing is clear and purposefully organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is capable. Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Minor errors in language do not impede communication.
<b>Proficient</b> <b>3+</b> <b>3</b> <b>3-</b>	4.5 4 3.5 3	The understanding of the source is straightforward and conventional. A generalized discussion of the source and its relationship(s) to the perspective(s) is/are adequately developed.	6 5 4	Appropriately chosen and developed position with straightforward and conventional, argumentation. The relationship between (see above) is generally developed and demonstrates adequate understanding of the assignment.	6 5 4	Evidence is conventional and straightforward. The evidence may contain minor errors and/or a mixture of relevant and unnecessary information. Discussion reveals a general acceptable understanding of social and application to the assignment.	6 5 4	The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is adequate. Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. There may be occasional lapses in control and minor errors; however, the communication remains generally clear.
<b>Beginning</b> <b>1+</b> <b>1</b>	2.5 2	The understanding of the source is incomplete or lacks depth. The discussion of the source and its relationship(s) to the perspective(s) is/are oversimplified and lacks development.	3.5 3 2.5	Confusing and largely unrelated position with repetitive, contradictory, and/or simplistic, argumentation. The relationship between (see above) is superficially developed and demonstrates an uninformed belief.	3.5 3 2.5	Evidence is somewhat relevant but is unfocused and/or incompletely developed. The evidence contains off topic detail. The discussion reveals an oversimplified and/or confused understanding of social and the application to the assignment.	3.5 3 2.5	The writing is awkward and lacks organization. Control of syntax, mechanics and grammar is inconsistent. Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Errors obscure the clarity of communication.
<b>Limited</b> <b>1-</b>	1.5 1	There is minimal understanding of the source. Discussion of the source and its relationships(s) to the perspective(s) is/are confused, inaccurate, or vague.	2 1.5 1	Irrelevant and illogical position with little or no relationship to the source or argumentation. The relationship between (see above) is minimally developed.	2 1.5 1	Evidence is either irrelevant and/or inaccurate. The evidence contains major errors. A minimal discussion reveals a lack of understanding of social and the application to the assignment.	2 1.5 1	The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impede communication.

<b>Insufficient 0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Does not attempt to address the assignment or is too brief to assess in any scoring category.</b>
---------------------------	----------	--

		<b>Dimensions of Thinking:</b> - Critical Thinking - Decision Making/Problem Solving		<b>Deliberate Inquiry:</b> - Research Process		<b>Communication</b>
<b>Levels</b>						

### Suggestions for Improvement

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● more elaboration on the importance and significance of the source</li> <li>● attempt to examine the complexity of the source's perspective</li> <li>● point out the various positions</li> <li>● demonstrates understanding of source</li> <li>● link source to position and argumentation presented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● present a clear position</li> <li>● select more appropriate evidence to support your position</li> <li>● draw a better relationship between evidence selected and position taken</li> <li>● greater depth of analysis needed</li> <li>● attempt more forceful and persuasive arguments</li> <li>● base arguments on sound ideas</li> <li>● organize related arguments better</li> <li>● develop ideas more logically and coherently</li> <li>● stay on topic</li> <li>● develop more counter arguments</li> <li>● point out weaknesses in opposing argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● present more accurate evidence</li> <li>● attempt stronger and more relevant examples</li> <li>● present more examples</li> <li>● develop examples in more depth</li> <li>● attempt more specific evidence</li> <li>● attempt a better relationship between examples, argument and position</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● attempt a stronger introduction</li> <li>● attempt a stronger conclusion</li> <li>● attempt greater fluency of your ideas</li> <li>● attempt better word choice</li> <li>● use more Social Studies vocabulary</li> <li>● eliminate spelling errors</li> <li>● eliminate grammatical errors</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

**Comments:**