Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100

**Conspiracy Theory Research Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statement of Purpose | 10 9 | 8 7 | 6 5 | 4 3 | 2 |
| Claim/theory is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained  alternate or opposing claims/theories are clearly addressed  claim/theory is introduced and communicated clearly within the purpose, audience, and task | Claim/theory is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present  alternate or opposing claim/theories are included but may not be completely addressed  context provided for the claim/theory is adequate within the purpose, audience, and task | may be clearly focused on the claim/theory but is insufficiently sustained  claim/theory on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused | may be very brief   |  | | --- | | may have a major drift | |  |   Claim/theory may be confusing or ambiguous | A claim/theory is attempted, but is vastly insufficient or unclear. |
| Focus | 10 9 | 8 7 | 6 5 | 4 3 | 2 |
| The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused.  Controlling idea or main idea of a topic is strongly maintained throughout the essay. | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused.  Focus is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus.  May be clearly focused on the controlling or main idea, but is insufficiently sustained, overly simple, or paragraphs are repetitive. | may have a major drift  focus may be confusing or ambiguous  At least one paragraph has little to do with the stated thesis  may be very brief | Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing |
| Intro / Conclusion / Organization | 10 9 | 8 7 | 6 5 | 4 3 | 2 |
| effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose | adequate introduction and conclusion | conclusion and introduction are weak, disorganized, or overly simple | Either the introduction or conclusion is missing. | Attempted but VERY deficient. |
| 15 14 | 13 12 | 11 10 9 | 8 7 | 5 |
| General Organization   |  | | --- | | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness  logical progression of ideas from beginning to end  strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | | General Organization   |  | | --- | | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:  adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end  adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | | General Organization   |  | | --- | | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident  uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end  weak connection among ideas | | General Organization   |  | | --- | | The response has little or no discernible organizational  structure  frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | | |  | | --- | | Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing | |
| Transitions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies between and among ideas | adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety between and among ideas | inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety (for example, only at the beginning of paragraphs) | few transitional strategies are evident | No transitional strategies |
| Evidence | 15 14 | 13 12 | 11 10 9 | 8 7 | 5 |
| The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant.  Use of evidence from sources is cited, smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete. | The response provides adequate support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves some depth and specificity but is predominantly general.  Some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise. | The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details, and achieves little depth.  Evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven or formatted inconsistently. | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details.  Use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant. | Evidence is insufficient, illegible, incoherent, off-  topic, or off-purpose. |
| Elaboration | 15 14 | 13 12 | 11 10 9 | 8 7 | 5 |
| Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques. Student is able to make interesting and specific observations about the evidence. | Adequate use of some elaborative techniques. Student has commentary on the evidence, but sometimes states the obvious. | Uneven use of elaborative techniques. Occasionally commentary lapses into general, basic, or simple statements. | Weak use of elaborative techniques. Commentary is general, basic, or simple. | Little to no elaboration on evidence. |
| Diction / Word Choice | 10 9 | 8 7 | 6 5 | 4 3 | 2 |
| The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language.  Literary terms / elements are correctly used, and enhance the essay. | The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language.  Literary terms / elements are general or generic but used correctly. | The response expresses Ideas unevenly, using simplistic language.  Literary terms / elements may be incorrectly used, but attempt to respond to the prompt | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing.  Uses literary terms incorrectly AND does not answer the prompt. | Words are used incorrectly with enough frequency to confuse the reader. |
| Conventions / Editing | 10 9 | 8 7 | 6 5 | 4 3 | 2 |
| The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions.  MLA is properly completed (for typed essays)  8 sources used (citations correct and follow MLA format) | Adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.  A couple MLA errors (for typed essays)  5-7 sources used (citations correct and follow MLA format) | Some errors in usage and sentence formation are present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed.  Multiple MLA errors, but formatting is attempted (for typed essays)  3-4 sources used (citations included but not formatted correctly) | Errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscured.  Inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.    Typed but not in MLA format (when requested)  1-2 sources used (citations missing and/or not formatted correctly) | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions.  Errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure  Not typed (when requested)  1 or no sources used (citations do not exist) |