|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric 40 points Formative** **Essential Questions:** **How did Napoleon Rise to power? (Childhood, education, military career)****How did Emperor Napoleon come to dominate Europe?****What were Napoleon’s most important Policies/ laws?** **What was Napoleon’s legacy , hero or tyrant?**  |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished**8 |  **Proficient** 6 | **Basic**4 | Unacceptable2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 extensiveand valid research with multiple (you provide number)and varied sources.--Combines and evaluates existingideas 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 validresearch with multiple sources.--Combines existing ideas to formnew 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 researchwith 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 ofvalid 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
 |