**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**