

Grade	Argument	Evidence	Organization	Technique
4.0	<p>Clearly articulated. Accurate. Arguable. Significant: Makes insightful connections to course questions and themes.</p> <p>Applied the appropriate keywords. The analysis is compelling, accurate, and arguable.</p> <p>Response paper clearly explains decisions made in the video to justify argument.</p>	<p>Specific. Relevant to argument. Accurate. Using relevant primary and/or secondary sources. Smoothly integrated.</p> <p>Proper citations.</p> <p>Response paper clearly explains why the evidence was chosen.</p>	<p>Clearly organized. Develops argument persuasively. Shows connections between evidence and argument. Video is proper duration.</p> <p>Response paper is clearly organized.</p>	<p>Well-composed shots and scenes. Deep engagement with film concepts and techniques. Attention to details such as fonts, color, and sound. Intellectually and creatively rigorous. No technical mishaps.</p> <p>Response paper is clearly written. No or few spelling errors. Proper citations.</p>
3.0	<p>An argument exists. Makes solid connection to course questions and themes. Connects to course themes.</p> <p>Applied the keywords. The analysis is solid, accurate, and arguable.</p> <p>Response paper explains decisions made in the video to justify argument.</p>	<p>Solid and relevant. Occasionally underdeveloped. Logical breaks/missing steps. Missing a few relevant primary and/or secondary sources. Missing a few citations or incorrectly formatted.</p> <p>Response paper explains why the evidence was chosen.</p>	<p>Organized but could be better structured. Develops an argument. Usually shows connections between evidence and argument.</p> <p>Response paper is organized but could be better structured.</p>	<p>Composed shots and scenes; good engagement with film concepts and techniques. Could use more attention to details such as fonts, font color, and sound. Good complexity, innovation and depth in execution. One or two technical mishaps.</p> <p>Response paper is mostly well written. No or few spelling errors.</p>
2.0	<p>Implicit argument. Part of argument is inaccurate. Unclear connections to course themes.</p> <p>Applied the keywords. While the analysis is solid, the keyword(s) are either tangential or other keywords would have been more appropriate. Did not apply the appropriate number of keywords.</p> <p>Response paper partially explains decisions made in the video to justify argument.</p>	<p>Provided but unclear connection to argument. Evidence is inaccurate. Missing citations or incorrectly formatted.</p> <p>Response paper partially explains why the evidence was chosen.</p>	<p>Organization makes it difficult to follow the argument. Video is too short or too long.</p> <p>Response paper's organization makes it difficult to understand. It is too short or too long.</p>	<p>Unclear transitions between shots and scenes; unclear engagement with film concepts and techniques. Needs significant more attention to details such as fonts, font color, and sound. The video is simple and does not show a clear engagement with using the techniques of moving images to convey audio/visual arguments. Significant technical mishaps.</p> <p>Response paper has significant grammar mistakes. The mistakes make parts of the response difficult to read. Citations or works cited improperly formatted.</p>
0	<p>No argument. Did not apply keywords or it is unclear if they are being applied.</p> <p>Response paper does not explain decisions made in the video to justify argument.</p>	<p>Does not support argument. No citations.</p> <p>Response paper does not explain why the evidence was chosen.</p>	<p>There is no clear logic to the organization. The video is too short.</p> <p>There is no clear logic to the organization of the response paper.</p>	<p>No apparent organizing concept or approach. Poor execution.</p> <p>Response paper is difficult to read due to grammar mistakes.</p> <p>Missing citations or works cited.</p>