Criteria	Ratings: 6	5/4	4/3	2/1/0
Content	<ul> <li>Thorough and meaningful consideration of significant ideas, issues, or concepts of the topic</li> <li>Authentic and original connection between the personal, anchors, information, and/or ideas</li> <li>Sophisticated, clear, and detailed understanding of the topic</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Consistent consideration of significant ideas, issues, or concepts of the topic</li> <li>Some connection the personal, anchors, information, and/or ideas</li> <li>Sufficient grasp of the topic and most relevant issues et al, without flaws in the understanding/gross simplifications</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Includes some discussion of relevant consideration of some ideas, issues, or concepts of the topic</li> <li>Makes some connections the personal, anchors, information, and/or ideas; connections may be thin, or addressed on a superficial level</li> <li>Basic grasp of the topic and relevant issues et al, with some flaws in understanding and/or gross simplifications</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Includes none to very little discussion of relevant ideas, issues, or concepts of the topic</li> <li>Makes none to very little connections between personal and the larger world; connections may be weak, or addressed on a less than superficial level</li> <li>Showing none to very little grasp of content, with many flaws in understanding/gross simplifications</li> </ul>

Criteria	Ratings: 6	5/4	4/3	2/1/0
Insight & Analysis	<ul> <li>Penetrating insight and depth of reflection</li> <li>Demonstrates appreciation: layers of complexity, critical reflection, ambiguities and dilemmas</li> <li>Conclusions are confident and informed, yet tentative and open to alternative viewpoints</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Thoughtful comments and reflections based on earnest engagement</li> <li>Demonstrates some evidence of critical ambiguities, layers of complexity</li> <li>Conclusions are straightforward and supported by evidence</li> <li>Evidence of some personal growth and self-understanding throughout the project</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Perfunctory grasp of ethical issues and its relevance to personal project</li> <li>May contain gaps in logic, faulty reasoning, or tenuous relevance to ethical content</li> <li>Superficial statements/conclusion may lack substantive support</li> <li>Inconsistent or insufficient evidence of honest engagement in the project</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No grasp of ethical issues and its relevance to personal project</li> <li>Contain many gaps in logic, faulty reasoning, or tenuous relevance to ethical content</li> <li>Unoriginal statements/conclusion s lack of substantive support from the literature</li> <li>No to very little evidence of engagement in the project</li> </ul>

Criteria	Ratings: 6	5/4	4/3	2/1/0
Expression	• Clear, coherent, and	Clear and	<ul> <li>May present gaps in</li> </ul>	• Lack of discussion;
	engaging communication that may include strength of persuasion, fluidity of composition, sophistication of diction, & imaginative and descriptive prose. • Engaging to read; style enhances the substance	<ul> <li>straightforward articulation of content.</li> <li>Thorough treatment of project topics, backed by substantive evidence</li> <li>Errors do not impede meaning</li> <li>Easy, smooth reading; style matches substances</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>discussion; ideas may lack clarity and thorough articulation.</li> <li>May present problems related to coherence and clarity</li> <li>mechanical errors may impede meaning</li> <li>May be difficulty to read due to mechanical or stylistic problems</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>ideas are not clear.</li> <li>None to very little coherence and clarity • Too many mechanical errors that impede meaning</li> <li>difficulty to read due to mechanical or stylistic problems/ show no effort of editing</li> </ul>