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| **Content 70%**  |  |
| **40.0 %****Compare and contrast the competing visions among stakeholders, identifying the areas where they conflict and discussing how those conflicts could be seen in the delivery system.** | Does not demonstrate understanding of the competing visions for health care delivery systems , including the issues and implications. Does not demonstrate critical thinking and analysis of the material. | Demonstrates only minimal understanding of the competing visions for health care delivery systems, including the issues and implications. Demonstrates only minimal abilities for critical thinking and analysis. | Demonstrates knowledge of the competing visions for health care delivery systems, including the issues and implications, but has some slight misunderstanding of the implications. Provides a basic idea of critical thinking and analysis. Include examples or descriptions. | Demonstrates above-average knowledge of the competing visions for health care delivery systems, including the issues and implications (in your own words). Develops an acceptable analysis of the conflicts. Utilizes some examples. | Demonstrates thorough knowledge of the competing visions for health care delivery systems, including the issues and implications. Clearly develops a strong analysis of the conflicts and implications. Introduces appropriate examples. |  |
| **30.0 %Use references and examples to support main points.** | Does not provide supporting examples. | Provides some supporting examples, but minimal explanations and no references. | Supports main points with examples and explanations, but includes few references to support claims and ideas. | Supports main points with references, explanations, and examples. Analysis and description are direct, competent, and appropriate of the criteria. | Supports main points with references, examples, and full explanations of how they apply. Thoughtfully analyzes, evaluates, and describes major points of the criteria. |  |
| **20.0 %Organization and Effectiveness** |  |
| **7.0 %Assignment Development and Purpose** | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear. | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive. The essence of the paper is contained within the thesis. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  |
| **8.0 %Argument Logic and Construction** | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses noncredible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis. | Argument shows logical progression. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Clear and convincing argument presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **5.0 %Mechanics of Writing (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use)** | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register), sentence structure, and/or word choice are present. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are used. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. A variety of sentence structures and effective figures of speech are used. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **10.0 %Format** |  |
| **5.0 %Paper Format (Use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | Template is not used appropriately, or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate template is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate template is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate template is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |  |
| **5.0 %Research Citations (In-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment and style)** | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct. | In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. |  |
| **Total Weightage 100%** |   |  |
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