**Comparative Leadership Analysis: C-E-R+E-R Rubric**

| Criteria | Exemplary (9-8) | Proficient (7-6) | Developing (5-4) | Emerging (3-1) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thesis/Claim | Presents a clear, thoughtful, and insightful thesis that makes a compelling, original comparison between the leadership qualities of the chosen Shakespearean character and the historical figure. | Presents a clear thesis that makes a reasonable comparison between the leadership qualities of the chosen Shakespearean character and the historical figure. | Presents a thesis that attempts to make a comparison, but it may be simplistic, underdeveloped, or lack clarity. | Presents a vague or unclear thesis, or fails to make a meaningful comparison between the chosen figures. |
| Analysis of Leadership Qualities | Provides an in-depth, nuanced analysis of leadership qualities (e.g. ambition, morality, decision-making) of both the Shakespearean character and the historical figure. Effectively identifies key similarities and differences. | Provides a solid analysis of the leadership qualities of both figures, identifying key similarities and differences. | Provides a limited or uneven analysis of the leadership qualities, with some key similarities and differences missing or underdeveloped. | Provides a superficial or inaccurate analysis of the leadership qualities, with few meaningful comparisons between the figures. |
| Use of Evidence | Seamlessly incorporates specific, relevant evidence from *Macbeth* and from historical sources to support the analysis. Evidence is well-integrated and clearly connected to the claims. | Includes relevant evidence from *Macbeth* and historical sources to support the analysis, though the integration may be uneven at times. | Includes some evidence from *Macbeth* and/or historical sources, but the evidence may be limited, loosely connected, or underdeveloped. | Lacks sufficient evidence from *Macbeth* and/or historical sources, or the evidence provided is irrelevant or inappropriately used. |
| Organization and Coherence | Response is exceptionally well-organized, with a clear and logical flow. Transitions effectively connect ideas, and the structure enhances the overall comparison and analysis. | Response is generally well-organized, with a coherent structure that supports the comparison and analysis. Transitions are present but may be uneven at times | Organization is inconsistent or underdeveloped, with some gaps or abrupt shifts in the flow of ideas. Transitions are limited or ineffective | Organization is unclear or illogical, making the comparison and analysis difficult to follow. Transitions are absent or inappropriate. |
| Grammar and Mechanics | Response demonstrates a strong command of standard written English, with few to no errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, or word choice. | Response demonstrates a generally good command of standard written English, with minor errors that do not significantly impede meaning. | Response contains several errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, or word choice that begin to interfere with meaning. | Contains frequent and/or significant errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, or word choice that seriously impede meaning. |