

Student Name:

Class:

Period:

Discussion Component	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Emerging	3 Basic	4 Skillful	5 Excellent
<b>Participation</b>	** Very little to no meaningful participation	** Some participation, but sporadic and not consistent	** Multiple instances of participation, though not highly active or strategically planned ** Sufficient but not advanced	** Active, consistent participation, as demonstrated verbally and non-verbally	** Advanced, highly active participation, verbally and non-verbally ** Leadership level of participation
<b>Argumentative Claims</b>	** No clear argumentative claims, interpretations, or views offered	** At least one argumentative claim, interpretation, or view offered ** Argumentative claim(s) simple, obvious, unoriginal, unclear, vague, or self-contradictory	** Multiple argumentative claims offered (or one strong claim offered) ** Argumentative claims partially or somewhat original or insightful, and mostly clear	** Multiple argumentative claims offered ** Argumentative claims demonstrate originality, insight, and a high degree of clarity and precision	** Multiple argumentative claims offered, cohering into an over-arching position ** Argumentative claims highly original, insightful, and advanced
<b>Evidence</b>	** Very little if any evidence used at all ** No demonstrated understanding of the role of evidence in argument	** Some limited use of evidence ** Partial understanding of the role of evidence in argument ** Reasoning often superficial or insufficient	** Most arguments supported with solid evidence ** Evidence is mostly if not fully aligned with claims ** Reasoning basically solid, if not much more than sufficient	** All arguments supported by evidence ** Evidence is aligned with claims ** Reasoning is persuasive and analytical	** Evidence very precisely supportive of each argument ** Evidence contains or is supplemented by highly persuasive warrants and reasoning ** Evidence highly credible
<b>Responses</b>	** Almost or actually no engagement at all with other views ** No real evidence of critical thinking	** Some limited engagement w/other views ** Refutation indirect, partial, imprecise, or dismissive ** Some critical thinking demonstrated, but of a limited depth	** Solid effort to engage with other views ** Refutation mostly responsive and comprehensive ** Refutation and engagement have signs of critical thinking depth	** Strong, fairly commanding engagement with other views and arguments ** Refutation responsive and comprehensive ** Active, consistent level of critical thinking	** Insightful, original engagement w/multiple views ** Refutation precisely and exceptionally responsive and comprehensive ** Very high level of critical thinking