**Integrated Project Rubric – Morales/Maners Honors 10**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Humanities Department Essay Rubric** | | | | |
|  | **Exceeds Standard** | **Meets Standard** | **Approaches Standard** | **Below Standard** |
| **Thesis**  10th – 20%  15 Points | * Focused and clear thesis that addresses all required parts * Thesis insightfully addresses task * Argument has depth and complexity * Thesis is placed appropriately | * Clear thesis that address all required parts * Thesis addresses task * Argument is present * Thesis is placed appropriately | * Thesis present, but some parts missing/inadequate * Thesis attempts to address task * Attempts to make argument, but lacks so-what * Thesis is placed appropriately | * Thesis undeveloped or unclear * Thesis does not address task * Lacks argument * Thesis is not placed appropriately |
| **Evidence**  10th – 20%  15 Points | * Choice of specific evidence is exceptional * Includes appropriate context for evidence * Evidence for all BTs is well developed * Evidence clearly supports thesis * Accurate MLA citations present at all times * Sources used are relevant, academic, specific, and exceptional | * Choice of evidence is specific and connected to thesis * Context is present but at times inconsistent * Evidence for BTs is developed * Evidence supports thesis * Accurate MLA citations and citations mostly present at all required times * Sources used are relevant, academic, specific and adequate | * Choice of evidence lacks specificity and/or is taken out of context * Attempts to use context, but often too much or too little used * Evidence not evenly developed for all BTs * Evidence at times disconnected from thesis * Some errors in formatting of MLA citations; some needed citations missing * Sources used are vague and possibly questionable | * Lacks evidence; mostly inaccurate evidence * Evidence is vague * Evidence is off topic * Many errors in formatting of MLA citations; many needed citations missing * Sources used are unacceptable |
| **Analysis**  10th – 30%  22.5 Points | * Analysis has depth and accuracy * Analysis consistently and clearly connects to all parts of thesis * Analysis clearly connects to *so what* * Analysis clearly connects evidence to BTs | * Analysis is accurate, but lacks depth at times * Analysis connects to all parts of thesis   Analysis connects to *so what*   * Analysis connects evidence to BTs | * Analysis at times undeveloped or unclear * Analysis attempts to connects to thesis; or only partially connects to thesis * Analysis does not address *so what* * Analysis lacks a connection to evidence or summarizes or restates evidence | * Analysis undeveloped, inaccurate, and/or unclear * Analysis does not support thesis * Analysis does not address *so what* * Analysis is irrelevant |
| **Organization**  10th – 15%  11.25 Points | * Intro is creative, relevant, and provides appropriate context * BTs are complex and build argument * Paragraphing highly fluent & reinforces essay structure * Conclusion is original, relevant, and emphasizes the *so what* * Accurate MLA Works Cited & paper format | * Intro is relevant and provides appropriate context * BTs build argument * Paragraphing generally fluent & reinforces the essay structure * Conclusion is relevant and emphasizes the *so what* * Accurate MLA Works Cited & paper format | * Intro is minimal and/or lacking * BTs are present but do not build argument or are repetitive * Paragraphing unclear at times &/or impedes the essay structure * Conclusion is minimal and/or lacking * Some errors in MLA Works Cited & paper format | * Intro is unclear * BTs weak or missing * No clear essay structure * Conclusion is unclear * Many errors in MLA Works Cited & paper format |
| **Language**  10th – 15%  11.25Points | * Words convey meaning clearly   and precisely; strong word choice   * Sentences are well built with strong /varied structure * Use of creative/appropriate transitions between thoughts, sentences & ¶s * Fluent integration of quotations & paraphrased evidence * Accurate spelling, grammar, and punctuation | * Words convey meaning clearly; adequate word choice * Sentences are adequate with some varied structure * Use of appropriate transitions between thoughts, sentences & ¶s * Quotations and paraphrased evidence are integrated * Inconsequential errors in spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation | * Meaning at times unclear because of word choice; simplistic/informal word choice * Sentences are at times awkward; some run-ons or fragments * Use of choppy transitions between thoughts, sentences & ¶s * Integration of quotations and paraphrased evidence is at times awkward * Noticeable errors in spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation | * Word choice impedes readability; word choice is weak * Sentences are awkward; many run-ons or fragments * No clear transitions between thoughts, sentences & ¶s * Evidence is rarely or never integrated * Errors in spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation are distracting |

**PAPER MEETS LENGTH REQUIREMENT PAPER IS WITHIN 50 WORDS (-5%) PAPER IS OVER 100 WORDS OFF (-10%)**

**Essay TOTAL : /75**

**Humanities Department Source Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OPCVL**  **Evaluation**  12.5Points | * Analysis and evaluation of origins, purpose and content is detailed and accurate with explicit reference to the value and limitations. | * Analysis and evaluation of origins, purpose and content is accurate, but value and limitations could be more detailed. | * Analysis and evaluation of sources is present, but reference to the value and limitations of origins, purpose and content is limited or at times inaccurate. | * Attempts to analyze source, but lack evaluation of origin, purpose and content. |
| **Language technique**  **Analysis**  12.5Points | * Analysis using specific language techniques is thorough and detailed; effects of techniques clear. | * Analysis using specific language techniques is accurate with some detail; effects of techniques present, but lack clarity. | * Analysis present, but needs detail and development of language techniques; alludes to effects of techniques. | * Describes rather than analyzes sources using language techniques; no effects present. |

**Missing Source Evaluation (-25%)**

**Source Evaluation TOTAL : /25**

**Project TOTAL: /100**