Grading for this assignment will be based on answer quality, logic / organization of the paper, and language and writing skills, using the following rubric.

| Points: 100 | Assignment 1: Essay - Exploring Ancient Mysteries |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Criteria | Unacceptable 0\% F | Meets Minimum Expectations 65\% D | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fair } \\ 75 \% \text { C } \end{gathered}$ | Proficient 85\% B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exemplary } \\ 100 \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ |
| 1. Clearly state the "mystery" and provide a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. Because some theories may sound farfetched, include the source or promoter of each theory such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. Weight: 40\% | Did not submit or incompletely stated the "mystery". Did not submit or incompletely provided a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. Did not submit or incompletely included the source or promoter of each theory such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. | Insufficiently stated the "mystery" and insufficiently provided a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. Insufficiently included the source or promoter of each theory such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. | Partially stated the "mystery" and partially provided a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. Partially included the source or promoter of each theory such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. | Satisfactorily stated the "mystery" and satisfactorily provided a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. Satisfactorily included the source or promoter of each theory - such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. | Thoroughly stated the "mystery" and effectively provided a brief summary of at least two (2) reasonable and scholarly theories which could explain the mystery. <br> Thoroughly included the source or promoter of each theory such as a scientist, a historian, a theologian, etc. |
| 2. Identify one <br> (1) of the theories as the most plausible and provide at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. <br> Weight: 35\% | Did not submit or incompletely identified one <br> (1) of the theories as the most plausible and did not submit or incompletely provided at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. | Insufficiently identified one (1) of the theories as the most plausible and insufficiently provided at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. | Partially identified one (1) of the theories as the most plausible and partially provided at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. | Satisfactorily identified one (1) of the theories as the most plausible and satisfactorily provided at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. | Thoroughly identified one (1) of the theories as the most plausible and thoroughly provided at least two (2) convincing reasons why the theory you have chosen is the best one to explain the mystery. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 3. Three (3) <br> references <br> minimum <br> (including class <br> text); Reference <br> quality | No references <br> provided | Does not meet <br> the required <br> number of <br> references; all <br> references <br> poor quality <br> choices. | Does not <br> meet the <br> required <br> number of <br> references; <br> some <br> references <br> poor <br> quality <br> choices. | Meets <br> number of <br> required <br> references; <br> some <br> references <br> poor quality <br> choices. | Meets or <br> exceeds number <br> of required <br> references; all <br> references high <br> quality choices. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4. Follows <br> writing <br> standards. <br> Meets page <br> minimums. | Followed few to <br> no writing <br> standards. <br> Did not meet <br> page <br> minimums. | Followed few <br> writing <br> standards. <br> May not have <br> met page <br> minimums. | Followed <br> some <br> writing <br> standards. <br> May not <br> have met | Followed <br> most writing <br> standards. <br> Met page <br> minimums. | Followed all <br> writing <br> standards. <br> Met page <br> minimums. |

