

Writing Assignment II (worth 40% of Part A mark)

	INTERPRETATION OF SOURCES (40% of WA II)	DEFENCE OF POSITION (40% of WA II)	COMMUNICATION (20% of WA II)
FOCUS	When marking <i>Interpretation of Sources</i> , the marker will consider the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of the interpretation of each source • quality of evidence drawn from the sources • quality of evidence drawn from knowledge of social studies • understanding of the assigned task 	When marking <i>Defence of Position</i> , the marker will consider the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of argument(s) selected to support the position taken • quality of evidence selected to support the position taken • understanding of the applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task 	When marking <i>Communication</i> , the marker will consider the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organization and coherence • contribution of stylistic choices to the creation of voice (e.g., sentence variety, word choice) • vocabulary (e.g., specificity, accuracy) • sentence construction (e.g., clarity, completeness) • grammar and mechanics (e.g., consistency of tense, punctuation, spelling, capitalization) Proportion of error to the length and complexity of the response must be considered when awarding a mark for <i>Communication</i> .
Excellent E	Interpretations are insightful, comprehensive, and address all sources. Evidence is specific and accurate, and errors, if present, do not detract from the response. The response demonstrates a thorough and perceptive understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The defence of position is based on one or more convincing arguments. Evidence is specific and accurate, and errors, if present, do not detract from the response. The response demonstrates a thorough and perceptive understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The writing is fluent and effectively organized. Effective stylistic choices may contribute to the creation of an engaging voice. Vocabulary is precise. The writing demonstrates confident control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors, if present, are inconsequential.
Proficient Pf	Interpretations are sound and purposeful but may not address all sources. Evidence is relevant and appropriate but may contain minor errors. The response demonstrates a clear understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The defence of position is based on one or more sound arguments. Evidence is relevant and appropriate but may contain minor errors. The response demonstrates a clear understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The writing is clear and logically organized. Appropriate stylistic choices may contribute to the creation of a distinct voice. Vocabulary is appropriate. The writing demonstrates capable control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not interfere with communication.
Satisfactory S	Interpretations are adequate but general and may contain misconceptions. Interpretations may not address all sources. Evidence is relevant but general and/or only partially developed and may contain errors. The response demonstrates an acceptable understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The defence of position is based on one or more adequate arguments. Evidence is relevant but general and/or only partially developed and may contain errors. The response demonstrates an acceptable understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The writing is straightforward and functionally organized. Basic stylistic choices may contribute to the creation of an adequate voice. Vocabulary is adequate. The writing demonstrates basic control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors do not seriously interfere with communication.
Limited L	Interpretations are overgeneralized and may contain substantial misconceptions. Evidence is superficial, may not always be relevant, and may contain significant errors. The response demonstrates a confused, yet discernible, understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The defence of position is based on oversimplified assertions and/or questionable logic. Evidence is superficial, may not always be relevant, and may contain significant errors. The response demonstrates a confused, yet discernible, understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The writing is awkward and uneven but discernibly organized. Awkward stylistic choices may contribute to the creation of an unconvincing and/or inappropriate voice. Vocabulary is imprecise and/or inappropriate. The writing demonstrates faltering control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors hinder communication.
Poor P	Interpretations are mistaken or irrelevant. Evidence, if present, is minimal, may be marginally relevant, and/or contains significant errors. The response demonstrates a minimal understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The defence of position is difficult to determine or little to no attempt is made to defend the position. Evidence, if present, is minimal, may be marginally relevant, and/or contains significant errors. The response demonstrates a minimal understanding of applicable social studies knowledge and the assigned task.	The writing is unclear and disorganized. Ineffective stylistic choices may contribute to the creation of an unsuitable voice. Vocabulary is ineffective and/or incorrect. The writing demonstrates a lack of control of sentence construction, grammar, and mechanics. Errors impede communication.
Zero Z	Zero is assigned to a response that fails to meet the minimum requirements of the Poor category. A zero may be assigned to one or more scoring categories.		