|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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.
 |