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Holistic Scoring Version (Side 1)
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I see the source material mostly misunderstood/misrepresented
I see a summary of the source material’s main ideas.
I see isolated discussion of how/why source material builds ideas.
I see ongoing discussion of how/why source material builds ideas.
I see ongoing discussion of how/why source material builds ideas.
I see an ongoing discussion of multiple perspectives.

I see no conclusion.
I see isolated evaluation, unrelated to the problem.
I see evaluation unrelated to the problem.
I see isolated clarification of the problem.
I see ongoing clarification of the problem.
I see ongoing evaluation.

I see a one-sided perspective.
I see an either/or perspective.
I see isolated relevant conclusions.
I see isolated relevant conclusions.
I see ongoing relevant conclusions.
I see ongoing relevant conclusions.

Isolated: A small percentage of the text, generally less than one third. More needs to do more than not.
Ongoing: Present in 1/3-to-2/3 of applicable text.
Mastery: Present in more than 2/3 of the text.
# The Critical Thinking Initiative Target

## Prose Categories

### Holistic Scoring Version (Side 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional +</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Correctness</th>
<th>Formatting, Documentation &amp; Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see that the writer's specific organizational choices enhanced my understanding of his/her ideas.</td>
<td>I see sophisticated sentence structures, diction, and tone that enhance my appreciation of the writer’s thinking.</td>
<td>If I see errors, they are isolated and typographical; I see this a virtually error free.</td>
<td>Virtually flawless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory √</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Correctness</th>
<th>Formatting, Documentation &amp; Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can follow how the thinking progresses from the first assertion to the final conclusion.</td>
<td>I see sentence structure, diction, and tone that allow me to understand the writer’s thinking.</td>
<td>I see errors in grammar and/or syntax but they do not impede my understanding of the writer's thinking.</td>
<td>Allowing for some errors, the paper largely observes necessary conventions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory -</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Correctness</th>
<th>Formatting, Documentation &amp; Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have difficulty seeing how the thinking progresses from the first assertion to the final conclusion. And/or the paper is essentially a list.</td>
<td>I see sentence structure, diction, and tone that hinder my understanding of the writer’s thinking.</td>
<td>I see patterns of error(s) in grammar and/or syntax that impede my ability to understand the writer’s thinking.</td>
<td>Errors persist that suggest a lack of understanding of proper formatting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>U:</th>
<th>P:</th>
<th>E:</th>
<th>Com:</th>
<th>Con:</th>
<th>L:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prose Grades</td>
<td>O:</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>F:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Grade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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