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| Top of Form**our Components of Health Care**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1Does Not Meet Expectations0.00%** | **2Approaches Expectations65.00%** | **3Meets Expectations75.00%** | **4Exceeds Expectations85.00%** | **5Outstanding100.00%** |
| **70.0 %Content** |  |
| **10.0 %Summary of the Health Care Bill** | Subject knowledge is not or is poorly demonstrated. Summary of the health care bill is absent, inappropriate, and/or irrelevant. | Subject knowledge is unclear and/or inconsistent. Summary of the health care bill lacks comprehension, and understanding of what the purpose is of the bill. Sufficient justification of the bill is lacking. This is weak or marginal coverage of the bill, with gaps in presentation. | Some subject knowledge is evident. Summary of the health care bill has some comprehension of the material and attempts to outline the proposal using outside sources. The bill is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The bill presents marginal justification of purpose. All the subject matter in the bill is covered in minimal quantity and quality. | Subject knowledge appears to be good. Summary of the health care bill shows integrative comprehension of the proposal. The bill's proposal is strong, showing a logical progression. The summary shows a smooth progression through the bill. There is a comprehensive coverage of subject matter. | Demonstrates thorough subject knowledge and understanding. Summary of the health care bill is a very well written piece that shows as integrative comprehension and thoughtful application of the material covered in the bill. Clear and convincing outline that is insightful and represents a persuasive understanding of the bill that covers beyond what is needed for the bill. |  |
| **15.0 %Identification of the Bill?s Stakeholders and their Positions Pro or Con** | Subject knowledge is not or is poorly demonstrated. Summary of the bill?s stakeholders? interest and their positions is absent, inappropriate, and/or irrelevant. | Subject knowledge is unclear and/or inconsistent. Summary of the stakeholders? interest and their positions pro or con is vague and irrelevant. Sufficient justification of the positions is lacking. This is weak or marginal coverage of the stakeholders? interest, with gaps in presentation. | Some subject knowledge is evident. Provides basic summary of the stakeholders? interest and positions, both pro and con and presentation is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The summary presents marginal justification of the stakeholders? interests. Stakeholder pros and cons are covered in minimal quantity and quality. | Subject knowledge appears to be good. A clear description of the stakeholders? interests is presented along with a thorough discussion of the various pros and cons of each. | Demonstrates thorough subject knowledge and understanding. A comprehensive description of the stakeholders? interests as well as their pros and cons is presented with rich detail and includes a logical and insightful discussion of all necessary elements. Includes supportive examples to further understanding. |  |
| **20.0 %Description of Effect on Delivery of Services** | Subject knowledge is not or is poorly demonstrated. A description of the effect on delivery of services that should govern is either missing or not evident to the reader. | Subject knowledge is unclear and/or inconsistent. A description of the effect on delivery of services is present, but it is incomplete or illogical. | Some subject knowledge is evident. A basic description of the effect on delivery of services is presented but remains cursory. | Subject knowledge appears to be good. A clear description of the effect on delivery of services is presented and includes a reasonable discussion of all necessary elements. | Demonstrates thorough subject knowledge and understanding. A description of the effect on delivery of services is presented with rich detail and includes a logical and insightful discussion of all necessary elements. Includes supportive examples to further understanding. |  |
| **20.0 %Description of Effect on Allied Health Professionals** | Subject knowledge is not or is poorly demonstrated. A description of the effect of allied health professionals is either missing or not evident to the reader. | Subject knowledge is unclear and/or inconsistent. A description of the effect of allied health professionals is present, but it is incomplete or illogical. | Some subject knowledge is evident. A description of the effect of allied health professionals is presented but remains cursory. | Subject knowledge appears to be good. A description of the effect of allied health professionals is presented and includes a reasonable discussion of all necessary elements. | Demonstrates thorough subject knowledge and understanding. A description of the effect of allied health professionals is presented with rich detail and includes a logical and insightful discussion of all necessary elements. Includes supportive examples to further understanding. |  |
| **5.0 %Research Sources (Sources are appropriate, relevant, etc. Also, sources meet assignment quantity and type specifications. Sources include three to five [3-5] academic resources.)** | Sources are not used or cited as required in the assignment instructions. Uses non-credible sources. | Source relevance is vague and/or inconsistent. Does not include references appropriate sources: three to five academic resources. | Source relevance is mostly applicable and appropriate. Includes references from appropriate sources: three to five academic resources. | Source relevance is applicable and appropriate in all instances. Includes references from appropriate sources: five or more academic resources. | Source relevance is applicable and appropriate in all instances as well as sparking interest in the reader to pursue further investigation. Includes references from appropriate sources: more than five academic resources. |  |
| **20.0 %Organization and Format** |  |
| **7.0 %Thesis Development and Purpose** | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear. | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive. The essence of the paper is contained within the thesis. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  |
| **8.0 %Argument Logic and Construction** | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses noncredible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis. | Argument shows logical progressions. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Clear and convincing argument that presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **5.0 %Mechanics of Writing (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use)** | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register) and/or word choice are present. Sentence structure is correct but not varied. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct and varied sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are employed. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. The writer uses a variety of effective sentence structures and figures of speech. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **10.0 %Format** |  |
| **5.0 %Paper Format (use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | Template is not used appropriately or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate template is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate template is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate template is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |  |
| **5.0 %Research Citations (in-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment and style)** | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present. | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct. | In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. |  |
| **100 %Total Weightage** |   |  |

Bottom of Form |  |
|  |  |  |