

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 <i>Macbeth</i> and from historical sources to support the analysis. Evidence is well-integrated and clearly connected to the claims.	Includes relevant evidence from <i>Macbeth</i> and historical sources to support the analysis, though the integration may be uneven at times.	Includes some evidence from <i>Macbeth</i> and/or historical sources, but the evidence may be limited, loosely connected, or underdeveloped.	Lacks sufficient evidence from <i>Macbeth</i> 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.