**US History Historical PSD Project Rubric**

**WRITING RUBRIC: Annotations Student: ­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores** | |  | | --- | | **Statement of Purpose/Focus** | | |  | | --- | | **Evidence,**  **Understanding &**  **Citations** | | |  | | --- | | **Organization** | | |  | | --- | | **Conventions** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A (4)**  **EXCEEDS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Advanced application of skill)*  10 S E O C  9.5 S E O C  9 S E O C | |  | | --- | | The response is **fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:**  • annotations is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained  • the annotations information is clearly relate to the context the topic | | |  | | --- | | The response provides **thorough and convincing support/evidence** . It includes the **effective use of sources, facts, and details.** The response achieves **substantial Historical depth** that is **specific and relevant**:  • **evidence** selected from sources is smoothly integrated, relevant, and concrete (specific)  • **plenty of MLA parenthetical citations** are used to cite evidence (and most are formatted  properly) | | |  | | --- | | The response has a **clear and effective organizational structure**, creating unity and completeness:  • **effective use of formatting and sequence**  • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end  • strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | | The response demonstrates **a**  **strong command of conventions**:  • **few, if any, errors are present in usage** (grammar) and sentenceformation  • **effective and consistent use** of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.  Effective sentence fluency |
| **B (3)**  **MEETS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Solid application of skill)*  8.5 S E O C  8 S E O C | |  | | --- | | The response is **adequately sustained and generally focused:**  • annotations is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present  • context provided for the annotation is adequately related to the topic | | |  | | --- | | The response provides **adequate support/evidence.**  It includes **sufficient use of sources, facts, and details.** The response achieves **some Historical depth and**  **specificity** but is often general in nature:  • **evidence** selected from sources is adequately integrated, and often relevant and concrete (with some exceptions)  • **a sufficient number of MLA parenthetical citations** are used  to cite evidence, although some may be inconsistent or imprecise | | |  | | --- | | The response has **an evident organizational structure** and a sense of completeness, though **there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected**:  • **adequate use of formatting and sequence**  • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end  • adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | | The response demonstrates **an**  **adequate command of**  **conventions:**  • **some errors in usage**  (grammar) and sentence  formation may be present, but **no systematic pattern of errors is displayed**  • **adequate use** of punctuation,  capitalization, and spelling  Adequate but not consistent sentence fluency |
| **C (2)**  **NEARLY MEETS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Partial application of skill)*  7.5 S E O C  7 S E O C | |  | | --- | | The response is **somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:**  • **Annotations not** clearly focused and is insufficiently sustained. Irrelevant material may be present  • **Annotations** may be somewhat unclear, unfocused, and there not attempt to relate it to the topic. Response is too limited to provide any information needed for annotations | | |  | | --- | | The response provides **uneven, cursory support/evidence**. It includes **partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details.** The response achieves **little Historical depth**:  • evidence from sources is weakly integrated and inconsistently relevant or concrete (specific)  • few MLA parenthetical  citations are used to cite evidence  • if sufficient citations are present, they are usually incomplete or incorrectly done | | |  | | --- | | The response has an  **inconsistent organizational**  **structure** and flaws are evident:  • **formatting and sequence, if present, are weak and should be revised**  • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end  • weak connection among ideas | | The response demonstrates **a**  **partial command of conventions:**  • **frequent errors in usage**  (grammar) may obscure meaning  • **noticeably inconsistent use** of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling  Limited to no sentence fluency |
| **D (1)**  **BEGINNING**  **TO ADDRESS THE STANDARD**  *(Minimal application of skill)*  6.5 S E O C  6 S E O C | The response **may be related to the purpose but may offer little or no focus (or little relevant**  **detail)**  • may be very brief  • may have a major drift  • Annotation may be confusing or ambiguous | The response provides **minimal support/evidence** for the writer’s thesis (main claim). It includes **little or no use of sources, facts,**  **and details:**  • use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant  • there may be no MLA  parenthetical citations in the paper | The response has **little or no discernible organizational structure**:  • lacks required formatting and sequence  • frequent extraneous ideas may intrude, making the paper difficult to follow | The response demonstrates **a**  **lack of command of**  **conventions:**  • **errors** in usage, sentence  formation, punctuation,  capitalization and spelling **are**  **frequent** and **obscure meaning on multiple occasions**  **lacking all sentence fluency** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **F (1)**  **Incomplete**  5 S E O C  4 S E O C  3 S E O C  2 S E O C  1 S E O C | Response is not related to the purpose and has no focus ( no relevant detail)  Response is confusing or missing | Little understanding of the topic, many aspects remain unaddressed. The content is too vague or contains mostly irrelevant details or many inaccuracies | The paper is unorganized, like a random collection of ideas and details, lacking a focus | A large number of errors in conventions distracts the reader and makes the writing difficult to read |

**WRITING RUBRIC: Argumentative Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores** | **STATEMENT OF**  **PURPOSE /**  **FOCUS:**  **Thesis and**  **Topic Sentences** | **EVIDENCE AND**  **CITATIONS** | **ORGANIZATION** | **CONVENTIONS** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A (4)**  **EXCEEDS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Advanced application of skill)*  10 S E O C  9.5 S E O C  9 S E O C | The response is **fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:**  • thesis (main claim) is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained through **the use of** **claim** (or counterclaim) **topic**  **sentences (reasons)** and quality concluding sentences  • alternate claims or counterclaims are clearly and adequately addressed  • thesis is introduced and  communicated clearly within the context | The response provides **thorough and convincing support/evidence** for the writer’s thesis(main claim). It includes the **effective use of sources, facts, and details.** The responseachieves **substantial depth** thatis **specific and relevant**:  • **evidence** selected from sources is smoothly integrated, relevant, and concrete (specific)  • **plenty of MLA parenthetical citations** are used to citeevidence (and most are formatted  properly) | The response has a **clear and effective organizational structure**, creating unity andcompleteness:  • **effective introduction and conclusion** for audience andpurpose  • effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies  • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end  • strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | The response demonstrates **a**  **strong command of conventions**:  • **few, if any, errors are present in usage** (grammar) and sentenceformation  • **effective and consistent use** of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.  Effective sentence fluency |
| **B (3)**  **MEETS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Solid application of skill)*  8.5 S E O C  8 S E O C | The response is **adequately sustained and generally focused:**  • thesis (main claim) is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present  • **most** (not necessarily all) t**opic sentences are claims** (or  alternate claims or counterclaims) that sustain the thesis  • context provided for the thesis is adequate  • there is a clear, but incomplete, attempt to address alternate claims or counterclaims | The response provides **adequate support/evidence** for the writer’sthesis (main claim). It includes **sufficient use of sources, facts, and details.** The responseachieves **some depth and**  **specificity** but is often general in nature:  • **evidence** selected from sources is adequately integrated, and often relevant and concrete (with some exceptions)  • **a sufficient number of MLA parenthetical citations** are used  to cite evidence, although some may be inconsistent or imprecise | The response has **an evident organizational structure** and asense of completeness, though **there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected**:  • **adequate introduction and conclusion**  • adequate use of transitional  strategies, with some variety  • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end  • adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | The response demonstrates **an**  **adequate command of**  **conventions:**  • **some errors in usage**  (grammar) and sentence  formation may be present, but **no systematic pattern of errors is displayed**  • **adequate use** of punctuation,  capitalization, and spelling  Adequate but not consistent sentence fluency |
| **C (2)**  **NEARLY MEETS**  **THE STANDARD**  *(Partial application of skill)*  7.5 S E O C  7 S E O C | The response is **somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:**  • **may be** clearly focused on the thesis (main claim) but is insufficiently sustained (multiple topic sentences are not clearly stated claim topic sentences)  • **conversely,** thesis (main claim on the issue) may be somewhat unclear and unfocused  • **counterclaims are not adequately addressed**, or the  attempt is too minimal to be successful | The response provides **uneven, cursory support/evidence** forthe writer’s thesis (main claim). Itincludes **partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details.** Theresponse achieves **little depth**:  • evidence from sources is weakly integrated and inconsistently relevant or concrete (specific)  • too few MLA parenthetical  citations are used to cite evidence  • **conversely,** if sufficient citations are present, they are usually incomplete or incorrectly done) | The response has **an**  **inconsistent organizational**  **structure** and flaws are evident:  • **introduction and / or conclusion, if present, are weak and should be revised**  • inconsistent use of basic  transitional strategies, with little variety  • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end  • weak connection among ideas | The response demonstrates **a**  **partial command of conventions:**  • **frequent errors in usage**  (grammar) may obscure meaning  • **noticeably inconsistent use** of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling  Limited to no sentence fluency |
| **D (1)**  **BEGINNING**  **TO ADDRESS THE STANDARD**  *(Minimal application of skill)*  6.5 S E O C  6 S E O C | The response **may be related to the purpose but may offer little or no focus (or little relevant**  **detail)**  • may be very brief  • may have a major drift  • thesis (main claim) may be confusing or ambiguous  • **most topic sentences are not claim topic sentences** (reasons)  that explain or advance the  argument  • **no counterclaims are**  **presented** | The response provides **minimal support/evidence** for the writer’sthesis (main claim). It includes **little or no use of sources, facts,**  **and details**:  • use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant  • there may be no MLA  parenthetical citations in the paper | The response has **little or no discernible organizational structure**:  • lacks a traditional introduction and / or conclusion  • few or no basic transitional  strategies are evident  • frequent extraneous ideas may intrude, making the paper difficult to follow | The response demonstrates **a**  **lack of command of**  **conventions:**  • **errors** in usage, sentence  formation, punctuation,  capitalization and spelling **are**  **frequent** and **obscure meaning on multiple occasions**  **lacking all sentence fluency** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **F (1)**  **Incomplete**  5 S E O C  4 S E O C  3 S E O C  2 S E O C  1 S E O C | Response is not related to the purpose and has no focus ( no relevant detail)  Thesis and topic ideas are confusing or missing | Little understanding of the topic, many aspects remain unaddressed. The content is too vague or contains mostly irrelevant details or many inaccuracies | The paper is unorganized, like a random collection of ideas and details, lacking a focus | A large number of errors in conventions distracts the reader and makes the writing difficult to read |

**Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Each project score below will be entered into Jupiter as a separate line item assessment grade**

**Basic project requirements grade: (4 points)** title page, table of contents, primary source document, bibliography, pictures, and note cards

**1 2 3 4 Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Basic written requirement: (4 points)** research paper and annotations

**1 2 3 4 Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Research Paper Rubric (16 points) Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Research Annotations Rubric (16 points) Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Rough Draft annotations/research paper (4 points) Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Final Project Grade Score: /44**