<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Understanding of Implications and Context   | • Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a highly informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper.  
• Broader implications of the central arguments are presented and thoroughly explored. | • Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a somewhat informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper.  
• Some broader implication of the central argument is presented and explored. | • Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a very general, somewhat less informed awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding questions addressed in the paper.  
• The broader implications of the central argument are alluded to but not necessarily explored. | • Arguments, ideas and voice reflect almost no awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding the questions addressed in the paper.  
• The broader implications of the central argument are neither presented nor explored. |
| Strong, Engaged Student Voice               | • Confident, highly fluid writing style; lively, engaging, articulate language. Paper has distinct, individual voice that serves to develop and further the argument throughout. | • Confident writing style; engaging, mostly articulate language. Paper has an individual voice that manifests itself at important points in the text. | • Engaged but somewhat tentative or basic writing style. | • Awkward, wooden, or confusing writing style: student voice is buried at best. |
| Conventions (for writing task only)         | • Grammar and punctuation nearly flawless.  
• Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations). | • Grammar and punctuation mostly correct.  
• Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations). | • Grammar and punctuation sometimes flawed, but not in a manner that undermines the clarity of the paper’s ideas.  
• Accessible, complete but somewhat imprecise bibliography and citations. | • Consistently defective grammar and punctuation.  
• Inappropriate and/or mistaken documentation of sources (poorly organized, incomplete bibliography and citations). |
| Presentation (for oral component only)      | • Communicates clear understanding of the paper’s ideas and arguments in an appropriate, consistently sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work.  
• Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper.  
• Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate. Presents relevant evidence that may not have appeared in the paper. | • Communicates clear understanding of the paper’s ideas and arguments in an appropriate, sometimes sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work.  
• Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper.  
• Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate. | • Communicates a mostly clear and basic understanding of the paper’s ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful though not necessarily sophisticated manner.  
• Presentation and response to questions may not fully reflect the coherence and depth of the paper, but they are nevertheless clear and thoughtful.  
• Answers to questions are mostly accurate, thoughtful, and effective. | • Fails to communicate a clear and basic understanding of the paper’s ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful manner.  
• Presentation and response to questions reflects the incoherence and general weakness of the paper.  
• Answers questions superficially, inappropriately, or incorrectly. |