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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td>Easily identifiable, clear, sophisticated and/or creative.</td>
<td>Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality. Appears in the introduction.</td>
<td>Unclear, vague, or unoriginal and/or does not appear in the introduction.</td>
<td>Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.</td>
<td>Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Paragraph structure supports thesis.</td>
<td>Generally clear and appropriate. May occasionally wander or be unclear how the structure helps support the thesis.</td>
<td>Generally unclear. Wanders, jumps from point to point, or lacks an overall sense of direction in relation to the thesis.</td>
<td>Unclear, often because the thesis itself is weak or non-existent.</td>
<td>Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, or analysis. Has no identifiable thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of evidence</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate examples used to support every point. Examples support the thesis, fit in their paragraphs, and are sufficient. Excellent use of secondary, primary, electronic, and printed sources. Excellent integration of quoted material into sentences.</td>
<td>Appropriate examples used to support most points. Examples may not always support thesis, appear where inappropriate, or be insufficient. Good use of secondary, primary, electronic, and printed sources. Good integration of quoted material into sentences.</td>
<td>Examples used to support some points. Points often lack sufficient supporting evidence and/or evidence is used inappropriately. Secondary, primary, electronic, or printed sources may need improvement. Quotes may be poorly integrated into sentences.</td>
<td>Very few or very weak examples. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no general statement. Use of secondary, primary, electronic, or printed source material may be insufficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic and argumentation</strong></td>
<td>All ideas in the paper flow logically and create a reasonable, sound argument. Counterarguments are acknowledged and refuted where possible.</td>
<td>Ideas usually flow logically and make sense. Counterarguments may be acknowledged, though not effectively addressed.</td>
<td>The argument is unclear and/or contains internal contradictions. Counter-arguments may not be acknowledged or effectively addressed.</td>
<td>Ideas do not flow logically, usually because the argument is unclear. May present a simplistic view of topic or make no effort to grasp alternative views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>Sentence structure, grammar, and diction are excellent; correct punctuation and citation. Minimal to no spelling errors; no run-on sentences; no sentence fragments; limited or no use of the passive voice.</td>
<td>Sentence structure, grammar, and diction are strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation often correct. May contain some spelling errors, run-on sentences or sentence fragments. A couple of sentences may be in the passive voice.</td>
<td>Some problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Significant errors in punctuation, citation, and/or spelling. May have several run-on sentences or sentence fragments. More than a couple of sentences are in the passive voice.</td>
<td>Significant problems in sentence structure, grammar and diction. Frequent errors punctuation, citation, and/or and spelling. May have many run-on sentences or sentence fragments. Abundant use of the passive voice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>