|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Unsatisfactory 0.00%** | **2 Less than Satisfactory 65.00%** | **3 Satisfactory 75.00%** | **4 Good 85.00%** | **5 Excellent 100.00%** |
| **70.0 %Content** |  | | | | | |
| **20.0 %Summarize the position/argument researched. Including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts.** | Summary of position/argument, including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts is not present. | Summary of position/argument, including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts is presented but incomplete. | Summary of position/argument, including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts is presented but in a cursory manner. | Summary of position/argument, including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts is convincing and rooted in research but may be outdated. | Summary of position/argument, including premises and conclusion, identifying the category of propositions, and quality and quantity of the parts is present, insightful and firmly rooted in current research. |  |
| **25.0 %Identify the assumptions of the position by drawing inferences from their communicated proposition to their position regarding human dignity. 4.2: Examine the connections between ethical communication and human dignity.** | Identification of the assumptions by drawing inferences from communicated proposition of human dignity is not present. | Identification of the assumptions by drawing inferences from communicated proposition of human dignity is presented but incomplete. | Identification of the assumptions by drawing inferences from communicated proposition of human dignity is presented but in a cursory manner. | Identification of the assumptions by drawing inferences from communicated proposition of human dignity is convincing and rooted in research but may be outdated. | Identification of the assumptions by drawing inferences from communicated proposition of human dignity is present, insightful and firmly rooted in current research. |  |
| **25.0 %Construct a valid and sound argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization. 4.4: Construct ethical arguments.** | Argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization is not present. | Argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization is presented but incomplete. | Argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization is presented but in a cursory manner. | Argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization is convincing and rooted in research but may be outdated. | Argument that contradicts, challenges, or improves the position of the organization is present, insightful and firmly rooted in current research. |  |
| **20.0 %Organization** |  | | | | | |
| **7.0 %Thesis Development and Purpose** | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis is insufficiently developed or vague. Purpose is not clear. | Thesis is apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis is clear and forecasts the development of the paper. Thesis is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis is comprehensive and contains the essence of the paper. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  |
| **8.0 %Argument Logic and Construction** | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses noncredible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis. | Argument shows logical progression. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Clear and convincing argument presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **5.0 %Mechanics of Writing (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use)** | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice or sentence construction is used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register) or word choice are present. Sentence structure is correct but not varied. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but they are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct and varied sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are employed. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. The writer uses a variety of effective sentence structures and figures of speech. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **10.0 %Format** |  | | | | | |
| **5.0 %Paper Format (use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | Template is not used appropriately, or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate template is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate template is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate template is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |  |
| **5.0 %Documentation of Sources (citations, footnotes, references, bibliography, etc., as appropriate to assignment and style)** | Sources are not documented. | Documentation of sources is inconsistent or incorrect, as appropriate to assignment and style, with numerous formatting errors. | Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, although some formatting errors may be present. | Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is mostly correct. | Sources are completely and correctly documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is free of error. |  |