

NAME:		PERIOD:	TOTAL SCORE:	QUICK COMMENTS:	
Critique Component	2 Unsatisfactory	4 Emerging	6 Basic	8 Skillful	10 Excellent
<b>Argument Analysis and Summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Argumentative position and/or claim either unclear or non-existent</li> <li>** No apparent command of argument components</li> <li>** Very little or very inaccurate reference to content details and historical context</li> <li>** Summary lacks both concision and control over word choice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Argumentative position and claim somewhat unclear or unfocused</li> <li>** Limited command of argument components</li> <li>** Some reference to specific textual details and facts from the historical context, but limited overall understanding</li> <li>** Summary demonstrates either limited concision or control over word choice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Argumentative position and claim clear and focused, though not fully precise or aligned</li> <li>** Basic command over argument components</li> <li>** Solid, minimally sufficient referent to specific textual details and facts from the historical context, with basic overall understanding</li> <li>** Summary is fairly concise and demonstrates basic control over word choice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Argumentative position and claim fully clear and focused, and precisely chosen and formulated</li> <li>** Clear, thorough command over argument components</li> <li>** Fully sufficient reference to specific textual details and facts from the historical context, with authoritative overall understanding</li> <li>** Summary is concise and demonstrates full control over word choice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Argumentative position and claim fully clear, focused, very finely chosen and expertly formulated</li> <li>** Impressive, advanced command over argument components</li> <li>** Insightful reference to specific textual details and facts from the historical context, with very authoritative overall understanding</li> <li>** Summary is originally and cleverly concise and well worded</li> </ul>
<b>Argument Critique and Refutaion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Very little if any critique</li> <li>** Almost or actually no engagement at all with the historical arguments</li> <li>** No real evidence of critical thinking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Some limited and incomplete critique</li> <li>** Arguments chosen to counter likely weak, close to being "straw men"</li> <li>** Refutation or response often indirect, partial, imprecise, or dismissive</li> <li>** Some critical thinking, but of a limited depth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Several arguments are basically critiqued, and at least partially refuted</li> <li>** Arguments chosen to counter of mixed strength</li> <li>** Refutation mostly responsive and comprehensive</li> <li>** Critique has signs of critical thinking depth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Strong, fairly commanding refutation of multiple arguments</li> <li>** Arguments responded to are strong, representing the other side's "best case"</li> <li>** Refutation responsive and comprehensive</li> <li>** Solid, engaged level of critical thinking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Insightful, original refutation of multiple arguments</li> <li>** Arguments responded to are very strong</li> <li>** Refutation precisely and exceptionally responsive and comprehensive</li> <li>** Very high level of critical thinking apparent</li> </ul>
<b>Presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Disorganized and very hard to follow</li> <li>** Poor command of standard language use</li> <li>** Lack of poise and enunciation</li> <li>** No extemporaneous and engaged thinking generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Some organization problems; portions hard to follow</li> <li>** Inconsistent command of standard language use</li> <li>** Intermittent or limited poise and enunciation</li> <li>** Limited extemporaneous and engaged thinking generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Mostly well organized, and most of the presentation not difficult to follow</li> <li>** Basic command of standard language use</li> <li>** Some poise demonstrated and solid enunciation and speaking skills used to enhance expression, emphasis, and overall communication</li> <li>** Some real extemporaneous and engaged thinking generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Well organized and easy to follow</li> <li>** Strong command of standard language use</li> <li>** Poise demonstrated throughout, and advanced enunciation and speaking skills used to enhance expression, emphasis, and overall communication</li> <li>** Notable extemporaneous and engaged thinking generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Very well organized and easy to follow</li> <li>** Exceptional command of standard language use</li> <li>** Impressive and memorable poise demonstrated throughout; distinguished enunciation and creatively deployed speaking skills used to enhance expression, emphasis, and overall communication</li> <li>** Rigorous extemporaneous and engaged thinking generated</li> </ul>