2025 1st quarter.

First rubric. Established six core criterias.

1. Clarity & Flow

- Strand 3: Exceptionally clear, seamless transitions, and coherent structure throughout.
- Strand 2: Generally clear with occasional dense passages; transitions are mostly smooth.
- Strand 1: Inconsistent clarity; ideas are sometimes disjointed or hard to follow.

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.

1. Clarity & Flow

- Strand 3: Exceptionally clear, seamless transitions, and coherent structure throughout.
- Strand 2: Generally clear with occasional dense passages; transitions are mostly smooth.
- Strand 1: Inconsistent clarity; ideas are sometimes disjointed or hard to follow.

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.