Please note that half points (1.5, 2.5, 3.5) will be given where appropriate.

Component	Poor (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)	Score				
	Content								
Complexity of Question	The big question addressed has only one reasonably defensible answer.	The big question addressed permits multiple defensible answers, but this isn't made explicit by the student.	The big question addressed permits multiple defensible answers and this is made explicit by the student.	The student makes explicit that the big question addressed permits multiple defensible answers, and the question itself is rather provocative.					
Importance of Question	No attempt is made to establish why the question matters beyond the context of this course.	The student gestures to the importance of this question to those outside this course, but doesn't offer any reasons why.	The student offers one clear and compelling reason why the question matters.	The student offers more than one clear and compelling reason why the question matters.					
Scope	The student explores aspects of the field of cryptography that are largely unrelated to other aspects of history or culture.	The student explores aspects of the field of cryptography that are related to other aspects of history or culture, but fails to make those connections explicit.	The student makes explicit connections from his/her big question beyond the field of cryptography itself, to some other aspect of history or culture.	The student makes explicit connections from his/her big question to multiple aspects of history or culture beyond the field of cryptography itself.					
Evidence	The evidence presented by the student for his/her answer is mostly weak and/or inappropriate for the question.	The student presents some reasonable evidence for his/her answer along with some other weak and/or appropriate evidence.	The evidence the student presents for his/her answer is generally appropriate and supports his/her argument.	The evidence the student presents for his/her answer is appropriate, supports his/her argument, and is notably varied and/or creative.					
Counter- Evidence	The student fails to consider answers other than the one for which s/he argues in the paper.	The student considers alternate answers, but offers very little counter-evidence against those answers.	The student considers alternate answers and offers some counter-evidence against those arguments.	The student considers alternate answers to his/her big question as well as potential objections to his/her evidence and offers compelling counter-evidence.					

Component	Poor (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)	Score
		Clari	ity		
Clarity of Thesis	There's no evidence that the student has a position on the central question.	The central question is addressed, but the student's position on that question isn't that clear.	The student's core position on the central question is explicitly stated and would be clear to other students.	The student's core position on the central question is very clear, as is the student's position on one or more related issues.	
Clarity of Evidence	The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence are described in a way that fellow students would not be able to understand.	The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would make at least some sense to fellow students.	The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would be mostly clear to fellow students.	The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would be very clear to fellow students—clear enough that elements of the paper could (almost!) be made available as a textbook supplement.	
Clarity of Arguments	The arguments made connecting evidence to thesis would be difficult for fellow students to follow.	The arguments made connecting evidence to thesis would make at least some sense to fellow students.	The arguments made connecting evidence to thesis would be mostly clear to fellow students.	The arguments made connecting evidence to thesis would be very clear to fellow students—clear enough to serve as examples of logical reasoning for future students.	
Voice	The student's voice sounds entirely artificial (e.g. using words the student is not likely to understand) and/or inappropriate to academic writing (e.g. far too informal).	The student's voice generally sounds natural and is appropriate to academic writing with the exception of a few weak spots.	The student's voice sounds natural (using words and phrasings not unlike his/her speaking voice) and is appropriate to academic writing.	The student's voice sounds natural, is appropriate to academic writing, and is entertaining in one way or another.	
		Present	ation		
Mechanics	So many grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes that it's hard to keep reading the paper.	Several grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—enough to slow down one's reading of the paper several times.	A few grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—nothing that would slow down one's reading of the paper for more than a second or two.	At most, only a couple of grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—nothing that impedes one's reading of the paper.	

Component	Poor (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)	Score	
References	References and/or citations are poorly formatted and it's unclear how references were used.	References and citations are appropriately formatted, but it's unclear how those references were used.	It's reasonably clear how references were used, but references and/or citations are inappropriately formatted.	References are appropriately formatted and citations make clear how those references were used.		
Total Score (44 Points Max)						

Comments: