

DEVELOPMENT (35%)

0 / 5

Use of evidence, details, examples, and facts to back up argument.

EXCEPTIONAL (5)	Claim is clear, insightful, and proven. Points are well supported with credible research and examples as appropriate. Author engages with counterargument and effectively refutes it with research-based evidence.
GOOD (4)	Claim is clear and proven. Points are well supported with credible research OR examples as appropriate. Author engages with counterargument and mostly refutes it with research-based evidence.
ADEQUATE (3)	Claim can be intuited and is mostly proven. Points are supported with evidence. Examples are present but may be thin or lean too heavily on opinion. Author introduces the other side of the argument, but refutation may be incomplete.
DEVELOPING (2)	Claim is difficult to figure out or may shift slightly as the paper goes on. Points support the claim but lack evidence. Author barely introduces counterargument or provides a weak counterargument.
INADEQUATE (1)	Claim is difficult to find and changes or doesn't match with the rest of the paper. Points lack support. Paper uses hardly any examples. No counterargument is introduced.

ORGANIZATION (25%)

0 / 5

Use of transitions, evidence of thought about the order of information

EXCEPTIONAL (5)	Paper is clearly organized around a claim, presenting evidence in an orderly fashion. Transitions make the paper flow easily. Introduction and conclusion add to the style and depth of the paper, functioning as integral parts of the writing.
GOOD (4)	Paper is organized and uses transitions throughout. Introduction and conclusion are present and effective. One or two jarring transitions may be present but are overall not distracting.
ADEQUATE (3)	Paper is organized, but may lack transitions at some points. Introduction and conclusion are present but a bit thin or disconnected from the rest of the paper.
DEVELOPING (2)	Paper shows some efforts toward organization but does not yet reflect a strategy of ordering thoughts. Transitions are only apparent in a few places; jarring changes between topics may distract the reader.
INADEQUATE (1)	Paper lacks an introduction or conclusion; few transitions are in effect, and the paper may become difficult to read at different points as the change in topic/evidence is too abrupt.

MECHANICS (20%)

0 / 5

Use of language, vocabulary, and conventions like punctuation; includes formatting

EXCEPTIONAL (5)	Language and vocabulary reflect a formal, academic tone appropriate to the audience addressed. Writer is confident and consistent in use of punctuation, with no spelling errors. Paper is formatted correctly in MLA style.
GOOD (4)	Language and vocabulary are appropriate to a college-level reading audience with only a few dips into less formal style. Punctuation and grammar are used consistently, with only a few, minor errors that do not distract. Paper may have 1 formatting error but is otherwise correctly done in MLA style.
ADEQUATE (3)	Language, spelling, and vocabulary are appropriate to a college course but may be informal or inconsistent briefly. Two distracting errors of spelling or grammar may be present. MLA format is mostly correct but may have 1-2 errors.
DEVELOPING (2)	Language, spelling, and vocabulary are at times appropriate to the college level, but the writing is not yet consistent. A pattern of errors in grammar or formatting may be present and at times obscures meaning. The paper may reflect a lack of proofreading or editing attention.
INADEQUATE (1)	Meaning is obscured in large portions of the paper by an accumulation of spelling, grammar, or language errors. No obvious attempts at proofreading are visible.

SOURCES (20%)

0 / 5

Evidence of outside research, smooth incorporation, correct citation both in-text and in Works Cited

EXCEPTIONAL (5)	Paper seamlessly integrates at least four outside sources into the text to provide evidence for the claim. Sources are scholarly or college-level and reflect significant research. Works Cited page is appropriately formatted.
GOOD (4)	Paper integrates at least three outside sources into the text to provide evidence for the claim. Most sources are scholarly or college-level and reflect significant research. Works Cited page is appropriately formatted.
ADEQUATE (3)	Paper integrates three outside sources, but the sources may not yet reflect significant research. In-text citations are mostly smooth but attribution may at times be clunky. Works Cited page is consistently formatted but may contain minor errors.
DEVELOPING (2)	Paper integrates outside sources, but the sources reflect less than expected research. In-text citations are jarring or may not be appropriately included. Works Cited page lacks consistent formatting, i.e., is not alphabetized and double-spaced, contains information errors, lacks publisher information and dates.
INADEQUATE (1)	Minor instances of plagiarism result from incorrect citation. Sources reflect bare minimum of research effort (i.e., 2 minutes on Google duplicates all research).