| **Descriptors** | **1 - Beginning** | **2 - Approaching** | **3 - Developing** | **4 - Capable** | **5 - Experienced** | **6 - Exceptional** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ideas and Content**  **(20%)**  The overall thoroughness and development of the response | The written response does not evaluate the discussion or respond to questions in the Student Guide. | The written response attempts to evaluate the discussion. Reponses to questions in the Student Guide are incomplete or unclear. | The written response evaluates the discussion but is undeveloped and addresses only some questions in the Student Guide. | The written response evaluates the discussion and addresses the questions in the Student Guide. | The written response thoroughly evaluates the discussion and completely addresses the questions in the Student Guide. | The written response thoroughly and expertly evaluates the discussion and thoughtfully addresses the questions in the Student Guide. |
| **Organization**  **(20%)**  Appropriate structure and overall organization | The written response lacks an organizational structure, is difficult to follow, and is unclear. | The written response attempts to use an organizational structure but is difficult to follow or unclear. | The written response is somewhat organized but is occasionally difficult to follow. | The written response is organized coherently to evaluate the discussion. | The written response is logically organized, using developed paragraphs to evaluate the discussion. | The written response is expertly and logically organized, using paragraphs with topic sentences, transitions, and concluding statements to evaluate the discussion. |
| **Word Choice**  **(20%)**  Engaging and effective language to support the response | The words used in the written response lead to confusion and a lack of clarity. | The written response attempts to use words that are appropriate to evaluate the discussion, but may do so incorrectly. | The written response uses appropriate words to partially or incompletely evaluate the discussion. | The written response uses appropriate words to evaluate the discussion. | The written response uses engaging, effective, and appropriate words to evaluate the discussion. | The written response uses engaging, effective, and appropriate words to evaluate the discussion thoughtfully and with nuance. |
| **Tone and Voice**  **(20%)**  The unique perspective of the writer, conveyed through tone, voice, and style | The tone and voice show little or no personality and objectivity. The style is inappropriate to the subject and purpose. | The tone and voice show little or no personality and objectivity. The style is often not appropriate to the subject and purpose. | The tone and voice only occasionally show personality and objectivity. The style is largely appropriate to the subject and purpose. | The tone and voice show some personality and objectivity. The style is appropriate to the subject and purpose. | The tone and voice of the evaluation show personality and objectivity. The style is appropriate to the subject and purpose. | The tone and voice of the evaluation show thoughtfulness, personality, and objectivity. The style is appropriate to the subject and purpose. |
| **Conventions**  **(20%)**  Mechanical and grammatical accuracy appropriate to the task, purpose, and audience | There are severe errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that make the writing unclear. | There are consistent errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that significantly interfere with the writing. | There are errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that cause confusion. | There are some errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling. The errors have little effect on the writing. | There are few errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling. The errors do not significantly affect the writing. | There are few or no errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling. |