

| Operation Lethe: Briefing Paper & Meeting Rubric (Group)   |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
|  |   |  |   |  |
| Briefing Paper (Will be rescored with the Revision ) (60%) |   |  |   |  |
| CATEGORY   | 4 - Above Standards   | 3 - Meets Standards  | 2 - Approaching Standards   | 1 - Below Standards  |
| <b>Position Statement</b>                                  | The position statement provides a clear, strong statement of the team's position on the issue.  | The position statement provides a clear statement of the team's position on the issue.   | A position statement is present, but does not make the team's position clear.   | There is no position statement.  |
| <b>Support for Position</b>                                | Includes 3 or more pieces of evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that support the position statement. Anticipates at least 2 opposing arguments and provides an effective response. | Includes 3 or more pieces of evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that support the position statement. Anticipates at least 1 opposing argument and provides an effective response. | Includes 2 pieces of evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that support the position statement. Does not anticipate any opposing arguments. | Includes 1 or fewer pieces of evidence (facts, statistics, examples, real-life experiences) that support the position statement.   |
| <b>Evidence &amp; Examples</b>                             | All of the evidence and examples are specific and relevant, and explanations are given that show how the evidence supports the team's position.   | Most of the evidence and examples are specific, relevant and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the team's position.   | At least one of the pieces of evidence and examples is relevant and has an explanation that shows how that piece of evidence supports the team's position.          | Evidence and examples are NOT relevant AND/OR are not explained.   |
| <b>Accuracy</b>  | All supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.  | Almost all supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.  | Most supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.   | Most supportive facts and statistics were inaccurately reported.   |
| <b>Audience</b>  | Demonstrates a clear understanding of the potential reader and uses appropriate vocabulary and arguments. Anticipates audience questions and provides thorough answers appropriate for the audience.          | Demonstrates a general understanding of the potential audience and uses vocabulary and arguments appropriate for that audience.  | Demonstrates some understanding of the potential audience and uses arguments appropriate for that audience.   | It is not clear who the author is writing for.   |
| <b>Structure &amp; Signaling</b>                           | Introduction is very effective; all topic sentences are clear; all transitions are smooth and logical; and conclusion finishes strong, summarizing the recommendation and most important arguments.           | Introduction is effective; almost all topic sentences are clear; almost all transitions are smooth and logical; and conclusion is clear, summarizing the recommendation and important arguments.             | Introduction meets the basic requirements; most topic sentences are clear; and conclusion summarizes the recommendation.  | Introduction is ineffective and possibly confusing, most topic sentences are not clear; and conclusion is missing or confusing.    |
| <b>Organization</b>  | Ideas and information are provided in a logical order making the paper easy and interesting to follow the recommendation and supporting arguments.  | Ideas and information are provided in a fairly logical order making the paper reasonably easy to follow the recommendation and supporting arguments.   | A few ideas and information are not in an expected or logical order, distracting the reader and causing some confusion.   | The ideas and information are not in any expected or logical order, distracting the reader and making the argument very confusing. |
| Writing Style/Mechanics & Citations (10%)                  |   |  |   |  |
| CATEGORY   | 4 - Above Standards   | 3 - Meets Standards  | 2 - Approaching Standards   | 1 - Below Standards  |
| <b>Capitalization &amp; Punctuation</b>                    | No errors in capitalization and punctuation, so the essay is exceptionally easy to read.  | 1-2 errors in capitalization or punctuation, but the essay is still easy to read.  | A few errors in capitalization or punctuation that catch the reader's attention and interrupt the flow.   | Several errors in capitalization or punctuation that catch the reader's attention and interrupt the flow.                          |
| <b>Grammar &amp; Spelling</b>                              | No errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.   | 1-2 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.   | 3-4 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.  | More than 4 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.   |
| <b>Sentence Structure</b>                                  | All sentences are well-constructed with varied structure.   | Most sentences are well-constructed and there is some varied sentence structure in the essay.  | Most sentences are well constructed, but there is no variation in structure.  | Most sentences are not well-constructed or varied.   |
| <b>APA Citation Format</b>                                 | No errors in citation format in the text or reference list.   | A few errors in citation format in the text or reference list.   | Multiple errors in citation format in the text or reference list.   | No resemblance to APA citation style.  |
| <b>Sources</b>   | All sources used for quotes, statistics and facts are credible and cited correctly.   | All sources used for quotes, statistics, and facts are credible and most are cited correctly.  | Most sources used for quotes, statistics, and facts are credible and cited correctly.   | Many sources are suspect (not credible) or are not cited correctly.  |
| Revision (10%)   |   |  |   |  |
| CATEGORY   | 4 - Above Standards   | 3 - Meets Standards  | 2 - Approaching Standards   | 1 - Below Standards  |
| <b>Feedback Addressed</b>                                  | All teacher feedback has been addressed, and additional revisions made on author's own initiative to improve the paper.   | All teacher feedback has been addressed.   | Almost all teacher feedback has been addressed.   | Less than two-thirds of teacher feedback was addressed.  |
| <b>Quality of the Revision</b>                             | The revised paper is significantly improved over the original based on the other parts of this rubric.  | The revised paper is improved over the original based on the other parts of this rubric.   | The revised paper is marginally improved over the original based on the other parts of this rubric.   | The revised paper declined in quality compared to the original based on the other parts of this rubric.                            |
| Meeting (20%)  |   |  |   |  |
| CATEGORY   | 4 - Above Standards   | 3 - Meets Standards  | 2 - Approaching Standards   | 1 - Below Standards  |
| <b>Team Coordination</b>                                   | Team responsibilities were clearly worked out ahead of time and team members knew when they should lead the response to a question.   | Team responsibilities were generally worked out ahead of time and team members usually knew when they should lead the response to a question.  | Team members were uncertain about when they should be leading the response to a question.   | Team members needed to figure out on the fly who was going to respond to a question after it was asked.                            |
| <b>Presentation</b>  | Team clearly articulates recommendation and reasoning, key arguments, and supporting evidence.  | Team clearly articulates recommendation and reasoning, key arguments, and supporting evidence.   | Team articulates recommendation and some of its reasoning includes arguments and some supporting evidence.  | Team is unable to articulate recommendation and reasoning and fails to support with evidence.                                      |
| <b>Counterarguments</b>                                    | Team has a ready response to counterarguments that always includes supporting evidence.   | Team responds to counterarguments, almost always including supporting evidence.  | Team able to respond to some, but not all, counterarguments.  | Team unable to respond to most counterarguments.   |