

**New York Performance Standards Consortium**

**Social Studies Research Paper**

**Circle one:** Teacher or External Evaluator

**Circle one:** Written or Oral

**Overall holistic evaluation** \_\_\_\_\_

06/2015

**Student** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of Research** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Needs Revision</b>
<b>Viewpoint: Thesis/Claim</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has sharply defined, concise, compelling thesis in response to a debatable question.</li> <li>▪ Clear introduction presents thesis in a highly engaging, compelling manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has clearly defined thesis in response to a debatable question.</li> <li>▪ Clear introduction presents thesis in an engaging manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Thesis or response to debatable question is comprehensible but not especially clear.</li> <li>▪ Introduction presents thesis in mostly comprehensible manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Thesis or response to debatable question is not clear.</li> <li>▪ Introduction is not clear.</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence and Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting arguments include specific, relevant, accurate and verifiable, and highly persuasive evidence, drawn from both primary and secondary sources.</li> <li>▪ Provides specific, relevant, accurate evidence for counter-argument, where appropriate.</li> <li>▪ Uses quotations and paraphrasing appropriately to sustain an argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting arguments include relevant, accurate and verifiable, and mostly persuasive evidence, drawn from both primary and secondary sources.</li> <li>▪ Provides relevant, accurate evidence for counter-argument, where appropriate.</li> <li>▪ Uses quotations and paraphrasing appropriately to sustain an argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence for supporting arguments is accurate and verifiable, mostly specific and relevant, and generally persuasive drawn from secondary sources.</li> <li>▪ Use of quotations and paraphrasing is mostly evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting arguments may include inaccurate evidence and lack clear, persuasive, or relevant evidence.</li> <li>▪ Quotations and paraphrasing do not effectively support arguments.</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Analysis and Persuasion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherent, complex, sophisticated arguments support thesis.</li> <li>▪ Examines multiple, [historical] interpretations, evaluating the context, reasoning, bias or reliability of varied sources and applies these through analysis to its arguments.</li> <li>▪ Clearly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly explains and analyzes the connection between all evidence and argument being made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherent, sometimes complex arguments support thesis.</li> <li>▪ Argument draws on, explains and critiques evidence from alternative points of view.</li> <li>▪ Mostly clear and thoughtful explanation or analysis of how the evidence supports each argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherent but rarely complex or sophisticated arguments support thesis.</li> <li>▪ Some alternative perspectives are presented but not always well examined or integrated.</li> <li>▪ Some explanation of how the evidence presented supports each argument, but the explanations are not always clear and thorough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments lack coherence and/or clarity.</li> <li>▪ Alternative arguments/perspectives are either missing or poorly integrated.</li> <li>▪ No explanation or analysis of how or why the evidence supports each argument.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Effective Organization</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each argument clearly flows in support of an overall structure.</li> <li>▪ Consistent, effective transitions develop ideas and arguments</li> <li>▪ Distinct, compelling, persuasive conclusion synthesizes arguments that support thesis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each argument presented supports an overall structure.</li> <li>▪ Usually uses effective transitions to connect ideas and arguments.</li> <li>▪ Distinct, persuasive conclusion partly synthesizes, but mostly represents the major arguments to support thesis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most arguments presented clearly support the overall structure.</li> <li>▪ Transitions are sometimes abrupt but the arguments mostly connect.</li> <li>▪ Conclusion represents major arguments and connects them to thesis; some synthesis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments are not organized in coherent paragraphs.</li> <li>▪ Arguments presented are not clearly or supportively connected to the overall structure.</li> <li>▪ Transitions between arguments are largely unclear.</li> <li>▪ Conclusion is either vague or unclear and poorly connected to the paper's major arguments.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Understanding of Implications &amp; Context</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a highly informed awareness of the larger historical, political, and cultural context surrounding discipline-specific questions addressed in the paper.</li> <li>▪ Broader implications of the central arguments are presented and thoroughly explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect an informed awareness of the larger historical, political, and cultural context surrounding discipline-specific questions addressed in the paper.</li> <li>▪ Some broader implications of the central argument are presented and explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments, ideas, and voice reflect a general awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding discipline-specific questions addressed in the paper.</li> <li>▪ The broader implications of the central argument are alluded to but not necessarily explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arguments, ideas and voice reflect almost no awareness of the larger historical, political, or cultural context surrounding the questions addressed in the paper.</li> <li>▪ The broader implications of the central argument are neither presented nor explored.</li> </ul>

<b>Student Voice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confident, highly fluid writing style; lively, engaging, articulate language.</li> <li>▪ Paper has distinct, individual voice that serves to develop and further the argument throughout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confident writing style; engaging, mostly articulate language.</li> <li>▪ Paper has an individual voice that manifests itself at important points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engaged but somewhat tentative or basic writing style.</li> <li>▪ Student voice is present, but inconsistent.</li> <li>▪ Writing is generally clear, but may be awkward or formulaic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Writing is confusing.</li> </ul>
<b>Conventions (for writing task only)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grammar and punctuation nearly flawless.</li> <li>▪ Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grammar and punctuation mostly correct.</li> <li>▪ Appropriate and consistent documentation of accessible sources (complete, well-organized bibliography and citations).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grammar and punctuation sometimes flawed, but not in a manner that undermines the clarity of the paper's ideas.</li> <li>▪ Accessible, complete but somewhat imprecise bibliography and citations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistently defective grammar and punctuation.</li> <li>▪ Inappropriate and/or mistaken documentation of sources (poorly organized, incomplete bibliography and citations).</li> </ul>
<b>Presentation (for oral component only)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communicates clear understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, consistently sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work.</li> <li>▪ Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper.</li> <li>▪ Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate. Presents relevant evidence that may not have appeared in the paper.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communicates clear understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, sometimes sophisticated way that demonstrates ownership of work.</li> <li>▪ Presentation and response to questions reflect the coherence and depth of the paper.</li> <li>▪ Answers questions accurately, thoughtfully, and effectively, developing new ideas when they are appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communicates a mostly clear and basic understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful though not necessarily sophisticated manner.</li> <li>▪ Presentation and response to questions may not fully reflect the coherence and depth of the paper, but they are nevertheless clear and thoughtful.</li> <li>▪ Answers to questions are mostly accurate, thoughtful, and effective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fails to communicate a clear and basic understanding of the paper's ideas and arguments in an appropriate, thoughtful manner.</li> <li>▪ Presentation and response to questions reflects the incoherence and general weakness of the paper.</li> <li>▪ Answers questions superficially, inappropriately, or incorrectly.</li> </ul>