

***20–1: Exploring Nationalism***  
**Written Response**  
**Scoring Categories and Criteria**

**Teacher Note:** A suggested scoring system has been included on each rubric. For example, a score out of 35 is suggested for Assignment II, and a score out of 35 for Assignment I which should be divided by 2 to comply with the weighting used by Alberta Education for the Grade 12 diploma exams. You may choose to change the scoring system to suit your marking system or to meet student needs.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**20–1: Exploring Nationalism Written Response Assignment II**  
**Scoring Categories and Criteria**

<b>Scores</b>	<b>Analysis of Source [5]</b>	<b>Quality of Argument(s) [10]</b>	<b>Quality of Evidence [10]</b>	<b>Quality of Presentation [5]</b>	<b>Matters of Correctness [5]</b>
<b>E Excellent</b>	The analysis of the source is insightful, with an exceptional understanding of the perspective. <b>[5]</b>	The argument(s) are thoughtful and convincingly support the position. <b>[10]</b>	The evidence is exceptional, accurate, and well developed. Discussion of the evidence shows an insightful understanding of social studies. <b>[10]</b>	The writing is fluent and well organized. It effectively integrates and sustains a main idea throughout. <b>[5]</b>	The writing is skillfully presented and error free in mechanics. It shows sophisticated sentence structure, sound grammar, and precise vocabulary. <b>[5]</b>
<b>Pf Proficient</b>	The analysis of the source is sound, with a capable understanding of the perspective. <b>[4]</b>	The argument(s) are clear and logically support the position. <b>[8]</b>	The evidence is purposeful and clear with only minor errors. Discussion of the evidence shows a capable understanding of social studies. <b>[8]</b>	The writing is clear and purposefully ordered. It coherently sustains a main idea. <b>[4]</b>	The writing is well structured and relatively free of mechanical errors. It shows capable sentence structure and grammar, and appropriate vocabulary. <b>[4]</b>
<b>S Satisfactory</b>	The analysis of the source is adequate, with reasonable understanding of the perspective. <b>[3]</b>	The argument(s) are appropriate and adequately support the position. <b>[6]</b>	The evidence is adequate, but may contain some inaccurate or unfocused content. Discussion of the evidence shows a general understanding of social studies. <b>[6]</b>	The writing shows satisfactory organization. It sustains a main idea with some lapses of focus. <b>[3]</b>	The writing shows basic control of sentence structure, mechanics, and grammar. Vocabulary is generalized. <b>[3]</b>
<b>L Limited</b>	The analysis of the source is incomplete, with a superficial understanding of the perspective. <b>[2]</b>	The argument(s) are confusing and only simplistically support the position. <b>[4]</b>	The evidence is marginal or unfocused with considerable inaccuracy. Discussion of the evidence shows a superficial understanding of social studies. <b>[4]</b>	The writing is awkward and lacking clarity. It frequently strays from a main idea. <b>[2]</b>	The writing varies in mechanical correctness, sentence structure, and grammar. Vocabulary is simplistic. <b>[2]</b>
<b>P Poor</b>	The analysis of the source is minimal, with an inaccurate or vague understanding of the perspective. <b>[1]</b>	The argument(s) are illogical or irrelevant and do not support the position. <b>[2]</b>	The evidence is inaccurate or extraneous. Discussion of the evidence shows limited understanding of social studies. <b>[2]</b>	The writing is unclear and disorganized. It fails to clearly communicate a main idea. <b>[1]</b>	The writing shows major faults in sentence structure, mechanics, and grammar. Vocabulary is inappropriate and imprecise. <b>[1]</b>