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| **Thesis** | * Easily identifiable, believable, original, well-developed, clear thesis that states a definite point to be argued.
 | * Good thesis, but slightly unclear in parts. Or, while not incorrect, lacking in originality or insight.
 | * Promising thesis is somewhat unclear or contains vague terms. Or, largely unoriginal, or offering relatively little that is unique or new.
 | * Thesis is difficult to identify at all. May be restatement of an obvious point.
* Provides little basis for a clear argument to be developed or structure to be devised
 |
| **Structure****of the essay** | * Overall structure of essay is clear and excellent organization is evident to strategically argue the point of view.
* Opening paragraph provides appropriate and thorough background for the thesis.
* Excellent transitions from point to point.
* Paragraphs support solid topic sentences and contain points relevant to the topic.
* Conclusion is strong and clearly brings closure to the argument.
 | * Generally, structure is clear and appropriate, though may ramble on in parts, or be too brief on one or two points.
* Opening paragraph provides sufficient background for the thesis.
* May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs either lacking clear topic sentences, or with two or more topics combined together.
* Conclusion is evident and brings closure to the argument.
 | * Generally, there is evidence of a structure which is at times unclear.
* Opening paragraph has the beginnings of good information.
* Ideas may at times wander or jump around.
* Some transitions.
* Some paragraphs lack an identifiable topic sentence.
* Beginning of a conclusion is evident.
 | * Organization is unclear because thesis is weak or not defined.
* Introduction lacks sufficient information to support the thesis.
* Transitions confusing and unclear.
* Few clear topic sentences.
* Conclusion has not been developed.
 |
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| **Use of Evidence** | * Primary source information and/or quality secondary source information used to support every point with at least one example.
* Examples support topic and fit within each paragraph.
* Smooth integration of quoted material into sentence.
 | * Examples used to support most points; generally quality sources (primary or secondary), though quality varies.
* Examples are usually provided to support points.
* Quotes and evidence generally integrated well into sentences.
 | * Examples used to support some points.
* Some points lack supporting evidence or examples.
* Quotes and evidence are evident, but at times inconsistently integrated into sentences and structure.
 | * Very few or very weak examples.
* General failure to support statements, or evidence given does not support the statement, because it is low-quality or irrelevant.
* Quotes and evidence not integrated into sentences.
 |
| **Analysis** | * Clearly relates evidence to topic sentences and to larger thesis.
* Analysis is fresh and exciting, posing new ways to think about the material and to make connections among different sources.
 | * Evidence often relates to topic of paragraph and to larger thesis, though some connections are not clear.
 | * Quotes and evidence are evident, but at times are not followed by the author’s analysis, and/or lack an explanation of how they relate to the paragraph topics and the larger thesis as a whole
 | * Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to the central thesis and arguments of the paper.
 |
| **Logic and Argumentation** | * All ideas in the paper flow logically; the arguments are identifiable, reasonable, and supported by evidence.
* Anticipates and successfully refutes/disproves objections or counter-arguments
* Makes original connections to outside material (whether from the class, other classes, or independent research) that illuminates the thesis and its constituent parts.
 | * Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense.
* Identifies some counterarguments, but these are addressed unevenly.
* Some insightful connections made.
 | * Argument is present, but may at times be inconsistent in presentation.
* Logic at times fails, or argument may be unclear.
* Some counter-arguments are identified, but this area needs more development.
 | * Ideas do not flow well.
* Simplistic view of topic.
* Faulty logic.
* No effort to address possible alternative views.
 |
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| **Mechanics, Grammar, Professional Format** | * Mainly error free.
* Uses APA citation correctly.
* Meets and exceeds all requirements for an excellent academic response.
* Meets and exceeds all requirements of the assignment.
 | * A few minor errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics.
* Generally uses APA citation correctly.
* Meets requirements for a well written academic response.
* Meets requirements of the assignment.
 | * Some errors in usage, grammar, and mechanics, beginning to interfere with the readability and meaning of the paper.
* Uses APA citation inconsistently and with some errors.
* Meets some requirements for an acceptable academic response.
* Meets some of the requirements of the assignment.
 | * Numerous errors in usage, grammar, and mechanics, affecting the readability and meaning of the paper.
* Many errors in APA citation, demonstrating lack of citation knowledge.
* Does not meet enough requirements for an acceptable academic response.
* Does not meet enough requirements to address assignment.
 |

**Plagiarism: A “0” grade will be given to a paper where significant sections of the paper were copied from other, unattributed sources.**
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