

Social 30-1 Written Response Assignment II Scoring Categories and Criteria

ANALYSIS OF SOURCE (6)	ARGUMENTATION (8)	EVIDENCE (8)	COMMUNICATION (8)	
<p>When marking Analysis of Source, markers should consider how effectively the student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyzes the source to demonstrate an understanding of the ideological perspective(s) reflected in the source <p>Note: Students may demonstrate their understanding of an ideological perspective(s) in one part of their essay or demonstrate their understanding of an ideological perspective(s) throughout.</p>	<p>When marking Argumentation, markers should consider how effectively the student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> establishes a position develops one or more arguments based on logic and reason establishes a relationship between position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source. <p>Note: DO NOT evaluate evidence in this category.</p>	<p>When marking Evidence, markers should consider how effectively the student uses evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is relevant and accurate reflects depth and/or breadth <p>Note: Evidence from social studies may include a theoretical, historical, contemporary, and/or current events discussion.</p>	<p>When marking Communication, markers should consider the effectiveness of the student's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fluency and essay organization syntax, mechanics and grammar use of vocabulary and social studies terminology <p>Note: Consider the proportion of error in relation to the complexity and length of the response to the assigned task.</p>	
<p>Excellent E</p>	<p>The analysis of the source is insightful and sophisticated; a comprehensive understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</p>	<p>The position established is convincingly supported by judiciously chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is consistent and compelling, demonstrating an insightful understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is perceptively developed.</p>	<p>Evidence is sophisticated and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive. A thorough and comprehensive discussion of evidence reveals an insightful understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</p>	<p>The writing is fluent, skillfully structured, and judiciously organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is sophisticated. Vocabulary is precise and deliberately chosen. The relative absence of error is impressive.</p>
<p>Proficient Pf</p>	<p>The analysis of the source is capable and adept; a sound understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</p>	<p>The position established is persuasively supported by purposefully chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is logical and capably developed, demonstrating a sound understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is clearly developed.</p>	<p>Evidence is specific and purposeful. Evidence may contain some minor errors. A capable and adept discussion of evidence reveals a solid understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</p>	<p>The writing is clear and purposefully organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is capable. Vocabulary is appropriate and specific. Minor errors in language do not impede communication.</p>
<p>Satisfactory S</p>	<p>The analysis of the source is conventional and straightforward; a generalized understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</p>	<p>The position established is generally supported by appropriately chosen and developed argument(s). The argumentation is straightforward and conventional, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the assignment. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is generally developed.</p>	<p>Evidence is conventional and straightforward. The evidence may contain minor errors and a mixture of relevant and extraneous information. A generalized and basic discussion reveals an acceptable understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</p>	<p>The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is adequate. Vocabulary is conventional and generalized. There may be occasional lapses in control and minor errors; however, the communication remains generally clear.</p>
<p>Limited L</p>	<p>The analysis of the source is incomplete and lacks depth; a confused understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</p>	<p>The position established is confusing and largely unrelated to the argument(s). The argumentation is repetitive, contradictory, simplistic, and based on uninformed belief. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is superficially developed.</p>	<p>Evidence is potentially relevant but is unfocused and incompletely developed. The evidence contains inaccuracies and extraneous detail. The discussion reveals a superficial and confused understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</p>	<p>The writing is awkward and lacks organization. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is inconsistent. Vocabulary is imprecise, simplistic, and inappropriate. Errors obscure the clarity of communication.</p>
<p>Poor P</p>	<p>The analysis of the source is illogical, tangential, and/or the source is simply copied; a minimal understanding of the ideological perspective(s) is demonstrated.</p>	<p>The position established has little or no relationship to the source or arguments. The argumentation is irrelevant and illogical. The relationship between the position taken, argumentation, and the ideological perspective presented in the source is minimally developed.</p>	<p>Evidence is irrelevant and inaccurate. The evidence contains major and revealing errors. A minimal or scant discussion reveals a lack of understanding of social studies knowledge and its application to the assignment.</p>	<p>The writing is unclear and disorganized. Control of syntax, mechanics, and grammar is lacking. Vocabulary is overgeneralized and inaccurate. Jarring errors impede communication.</p>
<p>INSUFFICIENT INS</p>	<p>Insufficient is a special category. It is not an indicator of quality. It is assigned to responses that do not contain a discernible attempt to address the assignment or responses that are too brief to assess in one or more scoring categories.</p>			
<p>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR SCORING COMMUNICATION</p>				
<p>Vocabulary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word choice and usage (appropriate and accurate application of words according to the context and meaning, including social studies terminology) <p>Sentence Structure and Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syntax (the way in which words are combined to form phrases, clauses and sentences; completeness, consistency, and variety of sentence construction must be considered) Organization (coherence, fluency, and focus) <p>Mechanics and Grammar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanics (punctuation, spelling, capitalization) Grammar (subject-verb agreement, pronoun reference, correctness of tense) 				