

Quarter 2

Changes: Allows for the critique of the prompt to encourage risk-taking; to acknowledge the prompts limitations and surpass it

1. Clarity & Flow

- **Strand 3:** Exceptionally clear, with seamless transitions—even when employing sophisticated, intentionally dense language that enhances the intellectual depth of the argument.
- **Strand 2:** Generally clear, though some passages may require additional reader engagement due to deliberate complexity.
- **Strand 1:** Lacks clarity due to unintentional obfuscation rather than a purposeful, rigorous style.

2. Depth of Interpretation

- **Strand 3:** Profound, multi-layered analysis that challenges conventional thinking.
- **Strand 2:** Solid insight with moments of depth, though occasionally surface-level.
- **Strand 1:** Basic analysis with limited exploration of complex ideas.

3. Responsiveness to the Prompt

- **Strand 3:** Fully addresses (or even critiques) the prompt, engaging directly with its nuances.
- **Strand 2:** Addresses the prompt satisfactorily but follows a conventional approach.
- **Strand 1:** Partially addresses the prompt or deviates from its core focus.

4. Profound / Interesting Ideas

- **Strand 3:** Highly original, thought-provoking, and conceptually daring ideas.
- **Strand 2:** Interesting ideas with some originality and depth.
- **Strand 1:** Ideas are basic and lack originality or complexity.

5. Risk-Taking

- **Strand 3:** Boldly challenges conventions or the prompt, taking significant intellectual risks.
- **Strand 2:** Occasionally ventures into innovative or unconventional territory.
- **Strand 1:** Sticks to safe, conventional arguments with minimal risk.

6. Scope

- **Strand 3:** Broad and interdisciplinary, engaging multiple dimensions and perspectives.

- **Strand 2:** Adequate breadth, though focus remains somewhat limited.
- **Strand 1:** Narrow in focus, with limited exploration of related ideas.