|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Purpose** To what degree does the artifact demonstrate the creator’s intent? | * The purpose is **not evident** or is **inappropriate** to the assigned task. | * The purpose is appropriate for the assigned task, but only **somewhat evident**. | * The purpose is appropriate for the assigned task and is **evident** throughout **most of the artifact**. | * The purpose is appropriate to the assigned task and is **strongly evident** throughout the **entire artifact**. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information**  Is the information accurate, credible, well-documented, sufficient to support the purpose, relevant, and is the information significant (facts or ideas that were central to the issue)?  Are assumptions clearly recognized as such? | * **Information** is not: * accurate, * credible, * well documented, * sufficient, * relevant, or * significant. * Assumptions are not clearly recognized. | * **Rarely**, information is:   + accurate, * credible, * well documented, * sufficient, * relevant, and * significant. * Rarely, assumptions are clearly recognized. | * **Frequently**, information is: * accurate, * credible, * well documented, * sufficient, * relevant, and * significant. * Frequently, assumptions are clearly recognized. | * **Consistently,** information is: * accurate, * credible, * well documented, * sufficient, * relevant, and * significant. * Consistently, assumptions are clearly recognized. |
| **Reasoning**  Does the reasoning logically move the reader from the information to the conclusion?  Does the organization make it easy for the reader to follow the creator’s thoughts?  Are relevant assumptions, biases, and alternate perspectives considered? | * The reasoning **does not logically** move the reader from the information to the conclusion. * **Lack of organization** makes it arduous for the reader to follow the creator’s thoughts. * Relevant assumptions, biases, and alternative perspectives are **not**:   + acknowledged   + valid   + justified. | * **Rarely**, instances of logical reasoning lead the reader from the information to the conclusion. * **Rarely**, the organization makes it possible for the reader to follow the creator’s thoughts. * **Rarely**, relative assumptions, biases, and alternative perspectives are:   + acknowledged   + valid   + justified. | * **Frequently**, instances of logical reasoning lead the reader from the information to the conclusion. * **Frequently**, the organization makes it possible for the reader to follow the creator’s thoughts. * **Frequently**, relevant assumptions, biases, and alternative perspectives are:   + acknowledged   + valid   + justified. | * **Consistently**, logical reasoning leads the reader from the information to the conclusion. * **Consistently,** the organization makes it possible for the reader to follow the creator’s thoughts. * **Consistently,** relevant assumptions, biases, and alternative perspectives are:   + acknowledged   + valid   + justified. |
| **Innovation**  Is the ideation evident, innovative, or independent?  Is the ideation sophisticated?  Does the ideation prompt further thought or reflection? | * Ideation is **not** evident, innovative, or independent. * Ideation is **not** sophisticated. * Ideation prompts **no further thought or reflection**. | * **Rarely**, ideation is evident, innovative, or independent. * Ideation is **rarely** sophisticated. * **Rarely**, ideation prompts further thought or reflection. | * **Frequently**, ideation is evident, innovative, or independent. * Ideation **frequently** demonstrates sophistication. * **Frequently**, ideation prompts further thought or reflection. | * **Consistently**, ideation is evident, innovative, or independent. * Ideation **consistently** demonstrates sophistication. * **Consistently,** ideation prompts further thought or reflection. |