	No Attempt	Emerging	Developing	Mastering
Evaluation of Evidence	0 (0%) - 0 (0%)	1 (.67%) - 10 (6.67%) - Writes in Generalities. - Uses primarily personal experience. - Accepts information "as is." Does not indicate how evidence may be limited or one-sided.	11 (7.33%) - 20 (13.33%) - Considers some evidence. - Moves away from egocentric perspectives toward a focus on evidence from class and outside materials. - Claims that evidence might be limited or one-sided, but does not explain why.	21 (14%) - 30 (20%) - Considers evidence from several sources. - Is able to avoid purely egocentric perspectives. - Recognized the limitations of the evidence and explains why it is limited.
Analysis and Synthesis	0 (0%) - 0 (0%)	1 (.67%) - 10 (6.67%) - Merely repeats information as truth of denies evidence without adequate justification. - Does not demonstrate an understanding of the flaws in the evidence. - Does not make connections among different sources. - Defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.	11 (7.33%) - 20 (13.33%) - Provides a cursory and superficial analysis of the evidence. - States that there are problems with the evidence, but only addresses with generalities. - Loosely ties information together from different sources. - Points out general contradictions or inadequacies in the information without explaining the specifics.	21 (14%) - 30 (20%) - Presents analysis of the information rather than accepting "as is." - Recognizes and avoids logical flaws. - Draws explicit connections between information from different sources. - Explores the contradictions or inadequacies in the evidence.
Drawing Conclusions	0 (0%) - 0 (0%)	1 (.67%) - 10 (6.67%) - Conclusions drawn heavily or completely on unsupported opinion. Draws unwarranted conclusions. - Does not use information to support conclusion(s). - Suggests no need for further explanation of the issue.	11 (7.33%) - 20 (13.33%) - Conclusions present a mix of unsupported opinion. - Selects some information to support conclusions, but may also use irrelevant information. - Identified holes in the information.	21 (14%) - 30 (20%) - Constructs cogent arguments rooted in information presented rather than speculation and unsupported opinion, avoids overstated or understated conclusions. - Selects the strongest and most relevant information. - Identifies holes in the evidence and suggests additional information or types of information that might aid in analysis.
Acknowledging Alternative Viewpoints	0 (0%) - 0 (0%)	1 (.67%) - 10 (6.67%) - Treats problem as simple one requiring an uncomplicated response. - Fails to identify or hastily dismisses alternative opinions. - Does not consider the impact on various stakeholders.	11 (7.33%) - 20 (13.33%) - Recognizes that the problem is complex with no clear answer. - Mentions the possibility of alternative options, without providing any details. - Suggests other stakeholders might be affected but doesn't specify who or why.	21 (14%) - 30 (20%) - Recognizes that the problem is complex with no clear answer, qualifies responses and acknowledges the need for additional information in making an absolute determination. - Proposes other specific options and weighs them in the decision. - Considers all stakeholders or affected parties in suggesting a course of action.
System Structure Inclusion	0 (0%) - 0 (0%)	1 (.67%) - 10 (6.67%) - Weak attempt at inclusion of system components. Inclusion is sparse - Placement of system components seem sporadic and out of place. - Weak explanations as to why component was included and what it is attempting to demonstrate. - Visual items are basic and lack detail.	11 (7.33%) - 20 (13.33%) - Sufficient inclusion of system components but descriptions were too general or somewhat unclear. - Few system components were included but descriptions were stronger and relevant to climate change topic. - Visual items are clear and showcase some detail.	21 (14%) - 30 (20%) - Sufficient to generous inclusion of system components - System components demonstrate clear relevance and greatly enhance discussion in written text. - Strikes a strong balance of written text to complement system component inclusion. - Visual items are clear, visually appealing and show strong detail