

		Explanation and Support		Communication
Focus		-Quality of explanations -Selection and quality of support -Understanding of the assignment		-Organization and unity -Vocabulary -Sentence construction -Grammar and mechanics (e.g. punctuation, spelling, capitalization)
Excellent E	8.0 7.5 7.0	Explanations are thorough and complete showing strong higher level thinking. Support is specific and accurate and relates to the question. Errors, if present, do not take away from the response. A full understanding of the question is shown.	2	The writing is smooth and effectively organized. Vocabulary is precise and effective. The writing shows confident control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors, if present, are unimportant.
Proficient Pf	6.5 6.0 5.5	Explanations are appropriate and purposeful showing a clear level of thinking. Support is relevant, appropriate and relates to the question. Response may contain some minor errors. A clear understanding of the question is shown.	1.5	The writing is clearly organized. Vocabulary is accurate and appropriate. The writing frequently shows effective control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not take away from communication.
Satisfactory S	5.0 4.5 4.0	Explanations are general and simple showing an acceptable level of thinking. Support is relevant but general and somewhat relates to the question. Response may be incompletely developed, and/or contains errors. An acceptable understanding of the question is shown.	1	The writing is generally clear and functionally organized. Vocabulary is generally accurate, but not specific. The writing shows basic control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not seriously interfere with communication.
Limited L	3.5 3.0 2.5	Explanations are overly simple and/or repetitive showing a confused, though identifiable understanding. Support is sketchy and may not relate to the question. Response may contain large errors. A partial and/or insufficient understanding of the question is shown.	0.5	The writing is uneven and incomplete but is somewhat organized. Vocabulary is inaccurate and/or inappropriate. The writing shows a uncertain control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors hurt communication.
Poor P	2.0 1.5 1.0	Explanations are random or minimal showing a negligible understanding. Support, if present, is incomplete and does not relate to the question. Errors are significant and/or frequent. A minimal understanding of the assigned task is shown.	0.4 0.2	The writing is unclear and disorganized. Vocabulary is ineffective and often wrong. A lack of control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics if shown. Errors make communication difficult to understand.

Insufficient

Insufficient is a special category.

INS

It will be assigned to papers that are off topic, or when there is little to no attempt to answer the question.

		Interpretation of Sources		Defense of Position		Communication
Focus		-Quality of interpretation of EACH source -Quality of evidence taken from the source -Quality of evidence taken from knowledge of Social Studies -Understanding of the assigned task		-Quality of argument(s) selected to support the position taken -Quality of evidence selected to support position taken -Understanding of the assigned task		-Organization and logic -Contribution of stylistic choices to the creation of voice (e.g. sentence variety and word choice) -Vocabulary (e.g. specific and accurate) -Sentence construction (e.g. clarity) -Grammar, mechanics (e.g. tense, punctuation, spelling, capitalization)
Excellent E	8.0	Interpretations are insightful and complete. Evidence is specific and accurate and errors, if present, do not take away from the response. The student shows a confident and perceptive understanding of appropriate social knowledge.	8.0	The defense of position is based on one or more convincing, logical arguments. Evidence is specific and accurate and errors, if present, do not take away from the response. There is a confident understanding of social knowledge.	4	The writing is fluent and effectively organized. A convincing, engaging voice is used. Vocabulary is exact and effective. Confident control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Minimal errors.
	7.5		7.5			
	7.0		7.0			
Proficient Pf	6.5	Interpretations are specific and accurate but may not address all sources. Evidence is relevant and appropriate, but may contain some minor factual errors. There is a clear understanding of appropriate social knowledge.	6.5	The defense of position is based on one or more sound arguments. Evidence is appropriate, but may contain some minor factual errors. There is a clear understanding of applicable social knowledge.	3	The writing is clearly organized. A distinct voice is used. Vocabulary is accurate and appropriate. Effective control of sentence construction, grammar and mechanics. Non-detracting errors.
	6.0		6.0			
	5.5		5.5			
Satisfactory S	5.0	Interpretations are valid but general and may contain minor confusion. Evidence is relevant, but general, may be incompletely developed, and/or contains minor errors. There is an acceptable understanding of appropriate social knowledge.	5.0	The defense of position is based on one or more adequate arguments. Evidence is relevant, but general and/or incomplete. There may be minor errors. There is an acceptable understanding of applicable social knowledge.	2	The writing is generally clear and functional. Voice is adequate. Vocabulary is generally accurate, but not specific. Basic control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not seriously interfere with communication
	4.5		4.5			
	4.0		4.0			
Limited L	3.5	Interpretations are over generalized and may have a lot of confusion. Evidence is weak, may not always be relevant, and may contain large errors. There is a confused yet somewhat visible understanding of appropriate social knowledge.	3.5	The defense of position is based on simple statements and/or questionable logic rather than on supportive arguments. Evidence is superficial and may not always be relevant. There may be large errors. There is a confused yet visible knowledge of social.	1	The writing is uneven and incomplete but somewhat organized. Voice is unconvincing. Vocabulary is generally imprecise, or inappropriate. Failing control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors hurt communication.
	3.0		3.0			
	2.5		2.5			
Poor P	2.0	Interpretations are mistaken or irrelevant. Evidence, if present, is incomplete and/or marginally relevant and frequently contains significant errors. There is a minimal understanding of appropriate social knowledge.	2.0	The defense of position taken is difficult to understand and/or little or no attempt is made to defend it. Evidence, if present, is incomplete and/or hardly relevant. A lot of errors with minimal understanding of social.	0.5	The writing is unclear and disorganized. Voice is ineffective and/or unsuitable. Vocabulary is ineffective and often incorrect. A lack of control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Many errors.
	1.5		1.5			
	1.0		1.0			

Zero
Z

Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of the Poor category.

A zero may be assigned to one or more categories.

Social 30-2 Assignment III: Position Response Marking Guide Name: _____ Mark: _____/20

		Exploration and Analysis		Defense of Position		Communication
Focus		-Quality of the exploration of the issue(s) -Quality of analysis of various points of view on the issue(s) -Understanding of the assigned task		-Quality of argument(s) selected to support the position taken -Quality of evidence selected to support the position taken -Understanding of the assigned task		-Organization and logic -Contribution of stylistic choices to the creation of voice (e.g. sentence variety and word choice) -Vocabulary (e.g. specific and accurate) -Sentence construction (e.g. clarity) -Grammar, mechanics (e.g. tense, punctuation, spelling, capitalization)
Excellent E	8.0 7.5 7.0	Exploration of the issue(s) is insightful and complete. Analysis is thoughtful and thorough and misconceptions, if present, do not detract from the response. There is a confident and perceptive understanding of various points of view and the assigned task.	8.0 7.5 7.0	The defense of position is based on one or more convincing, logical arguments. Evidence is specific and accurate and errors, if present, do not take away from the response. There is a confident and perceptive understanding of appropriate social knowledge and the assigned task.	4	The writing is fluent and effectively organized. A convincing and engaging voice is used. Vocabulary is precise. The writing shows a confident control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors, if present, are unimportant.
Proficient Pf	6.5 6.0 5.5	Exploration of the issue(s) is specific and accurate. Analysis is appropriate and purposeful but may contain minor misunderstandings. A clear understanding of various points of view and the assigned task.	6.5 6.0 5.5	The defense of position is based one or more sound arguments. Evidence is appropriate, but may contain some minor factual errors. There is a clear understanding of appropriate social knowledge and the assigned task.	3	The writing is straightforward and clearly organized. A distinct voice is used. Vocabulary is specific. The writing shows effective control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not detract from communication.
Satisfactory S	5.0 4.5 4.0	Exploration of the issue(s) is valid but general and may contain misunderstandings. Analysis is general and straightforward. An acceptable understanding of various points of view and the assigned task.	5.0 4.5 4.0	The defense of position is based one or more acceptable arguments. Evidence is relevant, but general and/or incompletely developed. The evidence may contain errors. There is an acceptable understanding of appropriate social knowledge and the assigned task.	2	The writing is generally clear and functionally organized. Voice and vocabulary are adequate. The writing shows basic control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not seriously interfere with communication.
Limited L	3.5 3.0 2.5	Exploration of the issue(s) is vague and may contain large errors. Analysis is limited and over generalized or repetitive, but somewhat visible. There is a minimal understanding of various points of view and the assigned task.	3.5 3.0 2.5	The defense of position is based on oversimplified arguments and/or questionable logic. Evidence is superficial, may not always be relevant, and may contain large errors. There is a confused, yet visible, understanding of appropriate social knowledge and assigned task.	1	The writing is uneven and incomplete but is somewhat organized. Voice is inappropriate and/or unconvincing. Vocabulary is imprecise and/or inappropriate. The writing shows a uncertain control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors reduce communication.
Poor P	2.0 1.5 1.0	Exploration of the issue(s) is wrong or unrelated. Analysis is minimal and/or tangential. There is a minimal understanding of various points of view and the assigned task.	2.0 1.5 1.0	The defense of position is taken is hard to understand and/or little to no attempt is made to defend it. Evidence, if present, is incomplete and/or barely appropriate with frequent large errors. There is minimal understanding of appropriate social knowledge and the assigned task.	0.5	The writing is unclear and disorganized. Voice is unsuitable and/or ineffective. Vocabulary is ineffective and frequently incorrect. A lack of control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors hurt communication.

**Insufficient
INS** Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It should be assigned to papers that are off topic, do not contain a Discernible attempt to address the task, or that are too brief to assess in any other scoring category.