***Scoring Categories and Criteria***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ANALYSIS OF SOURCE (10)**Consider how effectively the student: analyzes the source, demonstrates an understanding of the ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source**Note**: Students may discuss the ideological perspective(s) in one part of their essay, or it may be embedded throughout. | **ARGUMENTATION (15)**Consider how effectively the student: establishes a position, develops one or more arguments based on logic and reason, establishes a relationship between position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source.**Note**: DO NOT evaluate evidence in this category. | **EVIDENCE (15)**Consider how effectively the student has used evidence that• is relevant and accurate• reflects depth and/or breadth**Note**: Evidence from social studies may include a theoretical, historical, contemporary, and/or current events discussion. | **COMMUNICATION (10)**Consider the effectiveness of the students fluency and essay organization; syntax, mechanics and grammar; use of vocabulary and social studies terminology |
| **Excellent****E** | The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated. The understanding of the source and its relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is comprehensively demonstrated. | Judiciously chosen and developed argument(s) convincingly support the position taken. The argumentation is consistent and compelling, demonstrating an insightful understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is perceptively developed. | 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 studies and its application to the assignment. | 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. |
| **Proficient** **Pf** | The analysis of the source is sound and adept. The understanding of the source and its relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is capably demonstrated. | Purposefully chosen and developed argument(s) persuasively support the position taken. The argumentation is logical and capably developed, demonstrating a sound understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is clearly developed. | Evidence is specific and purposeful. Evidence may contain some minor errors. A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | 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 impeded communication. |
| **Satisfactory****S** | The analysis of the source is straightforward and conventional. The understanding of the source and its relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is adequately demonstrated. | Appropriately chosen and developed argument(s) generally support the position taken. The argumentation is straightforward and conventional, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is generally developed. | Evidence is conventional and straightforward. The evidence may contain minor errors and/or a mixture of relevant and extraneous information. A generalized and basic discussion reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | 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. |
| **Limited** **L** | The analysis of the source is incomplete or lacks depth. The understanding of the source and its relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is superficial and lacks development. | The argument(s) presented are confusing and/or largely unrelated to the position taken. The argumentation is repetitive, contradictory, simplistic, and/or based on uninformed belief. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is superficially developed. | Evidence is potentially relevant but is unfocused and incompletely developed. The evidence contains inaccuracies and/or extraneous detail. The discussion reveals a superficial and/or confused understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | 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. |
| **Poor****P** | There is minimal critical analysis of the source and/or the source is simply copied. The understanding of the source and its relationship to the ideological perspective(s) is disjointed, inaccurate, or vague. | If arguments are presented, there is little or no relationship to the position taken. The argumentation is irrelevant and/or illogical. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is minimally developed. | Evidence is either irrelevant and/or inaccurate. The evidence contains major and revealing errors. A minimal or scant discussion reveals a lack of understanding of social studies and its application to the assignment. | The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impeded communication. |