|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Thesis** | * Although-nevertheless format * Two reasons in the “although” and two in “nevertheless” | * Although-nevertheless format * At least one reason in the “although” and in “nevertheless” | * Did not follow format |  |
| **Topics** | * Began with transitional word * Matched the thesis |  | * Did not match thesis |  |
| **Context** | * Purposeful, meaningful, and led skillfully up to the data * Did context as needed for BOTH pieces of data | * Adequately covered the important plot elements leading up to the data * Did context for at least one piece of data and may have needed more for the second data. | * Disorganized, sketchy, or rambling attempt to give context. Did not say enough or said too much. | * Was not present or was in the wrong place. |
| **Data** | * Data was clearly, directly related to the thesis * Each body paragraph contained at least two distinctly different pieces of data * Data was correctly cited * Data was integrated | * Data was related to the thesis * Each body paragraph contained at least two different pieces of data * Data was correctly cited * Data may have been partially integrated, not fully included in the middle of a sentence. | * Fewer than 4 cited data * Data may not have been relevant to the main idea * The data may have been “stand-alone” * The data may not have been cited or not cited correctly. | * No data or limited data |
| **Warrant** | * Author had developed warrants for both pieces of data per paragraph OR an extended, richly detailed warrant addressing both data sources * Correctly used all of the following, and the connection was highly relevant and appropriately chosen, ideally from good literature, history, or film:   + In other words   + Because/since   + Connection | * Author developed at least one substantial warrant discussing both data sources * Correctly used “In other words,” “because…since” and made a relevant connection. | * Warrant was underdeveloped and may have consisted of fewer than three sentences. * Author did not address one or more of the following warrant elements: “In other words,” “because…since” or a relevant connection. * Connection may have been irrelevant | * Warrant was essentially not present or did not relate significantly to the thesis or topic. |
| **Diction and GUMS** | * Outstanding control over all elements of prose, including diction, syntax, and grammar. Though not flawless, the paper was clearly proofread and carefully composed. | * Some errors in diction and occasional moments of vagueness (over-used pronouns, fake questions), but overall a solid piece of work. | * Frequent errors in GUMS and vague language – fake questions, over-used pronouns, and dead words were a feature here. | * The prose here contains many flaws in GUMS and clarity. |