|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric 40points total Summative Ch 11.1 pages 300-306**   1. **I can explain the causes and spread of the Bubonic Plague using historical maps and other documents** 2. **I can analyze the social, political, and economic consequences of the pandemic** 3. **3. I can analyze the rise and fall of the Byzantine Empire, including its economic, social, and political developments.**   **Essential Questions:** What is the significance of the Byzantine Empire? What sustains a political state? | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished** 8 | **Proficient** 6 | | **Basic** 4 | Unacceptable2 |
| ***Organization*** | -- Extremely well organized.  --Introduces the purpose of the presentation clearly and creatively.  --Effectively includes smooth, clever transitions which are succinct but not choppy in order to connect key points  -- Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow.  --Ends with an accurate conclusion showing thoughtful, strong evaluation of the evidence presented. | | -- Generally well organized.  --Introduces the purpose of the presentation clearly.  --Include transitions to connect  key points but better transitions from idea to idea are noted.  -- Most information presented in logical sequence; A few minor points may be confusing  --Ends with an summary of main points showing some evaluation of the evidence presented. | -- Somewhat organized.  --Introduces the purpose of the presentation  --Includes some transitions to  connect key points but there is difficulty in following presentation.  -- Student jumps around topics. Several points are confusing.  --Ends with a summary or conclusion; little evidence of evaluating content based on  Evidence. | -- Poor or non existent organization.  --Does not clearly introduce the  purpose of the presentation  --Uses ineffective transitions that  rarely connect points; cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence for information.  -- Presentation is choppy and disjointed; no apparent logical order of presentation  --Ends without a summary or conclusion. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished** | **Proficient** | **Basic** | **Unacceptable** |
| ***Content: Depth and Accuracy Content. Real World Examples/***  ***Connections*** | --Speaker provides an accurate and complete explanation of key concepts and theories, drawing upon relevant literature. Applications of theory are included to illuminate issues.  --Provides evidence of extensive  and valid research with multiple (you provide number)  and varied sources.  --Combines and evaluates existing  ideas to form new insights.  --Information completely accurate; all names and facts were precise and explicit  --Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. | --For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications of theory are included.  --Presents evidence of valid  research with multiple sources.  --Combines existing ideas to form  new insights.  --No significant errors are made; a few inconsistencies or errors in information.  --Level of presentation is generally appropriate. | --Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little attempt is made to tie in theory. There is a great deal of information that is not connected to the presentation thesis.  --Presents evidence of research  with sources.  --Combines existing ideas.  --Enough errors are made to distract a knowledgeable listener, but some information is accurate.  --Portions of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. | --No reference is made to literature or theory. Thesis not clear; information included that does not support thesis in any way.  -Presents little or no evidence of  valid research.  --Shows little evidence of the combination of ideas.  --Information included is sufficiently inaccurate that the listener cannot depend on the presentation as a source of accurate information.  --Presentation consistently is too elementary or too sophisticated for the audience. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished** | **Proficient** | **Basic** | **Unacceptable** |
| *Creativity* | --Uses the unexpected to full advantage; very original, clever, and creative approach that captures audience's attention. | --Some originality apparent; clever at times; good variety and blending of materials/media. | --Little or no variation; a few original touches but for the most part material presented with little originality or interpretation. | -- Bland, predictable, and lacked “zip. Repetitive with little or no variety; little creative energy used. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished** | | **Proficient** | **Basic** | **Unacceptable** |
| Audience Response | --Involved the audience in the presentation; held the audience's attention throughout. | --Presented facts with some interesting "twists"; held the audience's attention most of the time. | | --Some related facts but went off topic and lost the audience. | --Incoherent; audience lost interest. |
| Attendance and Productivity /Collaboration | --Involved all the group members in the research and presentation. Used time wisely and worked collaboratively /efficiently | Some Group members were Involved  In the research and presentation. Used time wisely and worked collaboratively /efficiently most of the time. One absence | | --Little collaboration – Did not use time wisely  -Off task  \_received verbal warning   * More than 2 absences | * No work * No collaboration * Poor attendance |