**Exam Rubric**

**Question One (20%): How the policies of the United States and China towards each other have changed**

**(Each question is scored out of 100 and then weighted)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill Assessed** | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
| Recalled facts and basic concepts important to the study of China, the U.S. and the broader Asian region. | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material. Used appropriate concepts/theories(60-59) | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material.(58-51) | Demonstrated a solid understanding of the subject matter. (50-46)  | Demonstrated a limited understanding of the subject matter. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(45-39)  | Demonstrated little to no understanding of the subject matter. Factual errors. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(38<) |
| Developed an empirically well-grounded and persuasive argument. | Used specific and convincing examples from our materials to support your argument, making insightful and applicable connections (30) | Used relevant examples from our materials to support claims in your own writing, making applicable connections.(29-28.5) | Used examples from materials studied and general knowledge to support most claims in your own writing, with some connections made among material studied.(28-25) | Used incomplete or vaguely developed examples which only partially supported claims. Little to no connection between materials.(24) | Used incomplete or irrelevant examples. Assertions unsupported. Little to no connection made between materials cited and the structure of an analytical argument. (20) |
| Followed directions and produced a legible document. Note: the exam is not intended to test grammar or style knowledge, but it was still possible to make “unforced errors” of mis-spelling, etc. | Utilized a logical and clear presentation format. Made essentially no errors – (10) | Employed a logical presentation format, with minimal unforced errors (<2). (9) | Presentation format worked. Occasional errors (<4) did not hinder comprehension. (8) | Demonstrated limited ability to follow directions. 4-6 errors made comprehension difficult. (6) | Compromised comprehension by errors and lack of thought put into the presentation.(5) |

Question Two (40%): Climate Change: Draw Connections across Different Dimensions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill Assessed** | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
| Applied information about the past and present U.S.-China relationship to draw connections across different dimensions. | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material, which enabled particularly insightful analysis. (30) | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material. Used appropriate concepts/theories.(29-28.5) | Demonstrated a solid understanding of the subject matter. We will continue to work on using concepts and theories to generate insightful analysis(28-25) | Demonstrated a limited understanding of the subject matter and/or a limited ability to build analysis. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(24) | Demonstrated little to no understanding of the subject matter. Factual errors. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(20) |
| Developed an empirically well-grounded argument. | Used specific and convincing examples from our materials to support your own argument, making insightful and applicable connections between texts and between texts and the proposition. (40) | Used relevant examples from our materials to support claims in your own writing, making applicable connections between texts and between texts and proposition.(39-33.5) | Used examples from materials studied and general knowledge to support most claims in your own writing, with some connections made among material studied.(33-31)  | Used incomplete or vaguely developed examples which only partially supported claims. Little to no connection between materials; need to work on analytical thinking.(30-26) | Used incomplete or irrelevant examples. Assertions unsupported. Little to no connection made between materials cited and the structure of an analytical argument. (25) |
| Elaborate a sophisticated analysis of the situation in Spring 2021. | Structured arguments for maximum clarity and effect. Used language that was precise, engaging, and appropriate to purpose/professional caliber. (20) | Structured arguments logically, for clarity and effect. Used language that was fluent, and appropriate to purpose.(19-17.5) | Used basic but appropriate language and applied a simple but comprehensible structure to your argument.  (17-15) | Used basic language. The structure of your argument compromised comprehension.(14-13) | Chose language that was unclear and/or inappropriate and significantly compromised the effectiveness of your presentation.  (12) |
| Followed directions and produced a legible document.  | Utilized a logical and clear presentation format. Made essentially no errors – (10) | Employed a logical presentation format, with minimal unforced errors (<2). (9) | Presentation format worked. Occasional errors (<4) did not hinder comprehension. (8) | Demonstrated limited ability to follow directions. 4-6 errors made comprehension difficult. (6) | Compromised comprehension by errors and lack of thought put into the presentation.(5) |

Question Three: Briefing Memo (40%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Skill Assessed** | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
| Was able to formulate ideas about future policies the U.S. and/or China should pursue.  | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material, which enabled particularly insightful analysis. (30) | Demonstrated a conscious and thorough understanding of the material. Used appropriate concepts/theories.(29-28.5) | Demonstrated a solid understanding of the subject matter. We will continue to work on using concepts and theories to generate insightful analysis(28-25) | Demonstrated a limited understanding of the subject matter and/or a limited ability to build analysis. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(24) | Demonstrated little to no understanding of the subject matter. Factual errors. Did not use, or used incorrectly, concepts & theories.(20) |
| Justified your thinking. | Used specific and convincing examples from our materials to support your own argument, making insightful and applicable connections between texts and between texts and the proposition. (40) | Used relevant examples from our materials to support claims in your own writing, making applicable connections between texts and between texts and proposition.(39-33.5) | Used examples from materials studied and general knowledge to support most claims in your own writing, with some connections made among material studied.(33-31)  | Used incomplete or vaguely developed examples which only partially supported claims. Little to no connection between materials; need to work on analytical thinking.(30-26) | Used incomplete or irrelevant examples. Assertions unsupported. Little to no connection made between materials cited and the structure of an analytical argument. (25) |
| Wrote an analytically sound and persuasive briefing paper. Coherently articulated arguments related to the course content.  | Structured arguments for maximum clarity and effect. Used language that was precise, engaging, and appropriate to purpose/professional caliber. (30) | Structured arguments logically, for clarity and effect. Used language that was fluent, and appropriate to purpose.(29-27.5) | Used basic but appropriate language and applied a simple but comprehensible structure to your argument.  (27-25) | Used basic language. The structure of your argument compromised comprehension.(24-23) | Chose language that was unclear and/or inappropriate and significantly compromised the effectiveness of your presentation.  (22<) |