

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Rationale	No clear rationale or a weak rationale for the project	Some rationale presented, begins to motivate the work	Provides and discusses a suitable rationale	Persuasive and creative rationale
Methodological Approach	Not clear what methods were used or why, or an inappropriate methodology	Methodology is generally appropriate and properly executed	Methodology clearly described and justified, well-chosen and appropriate, and well-executed	Creative and sophisticated methods
Analysis of data/evidence	Draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented	Some appropriate use of evidence but makes few or simplistic connections, evidence is over- or under-interpreted	Good analysis, makes appropriate connections, evidence is interpreted reasonably	Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence and new insights are provided in interpretation
Overall Scholarly Context	Does not demonstrate awareness of relevant scholarly literature, over-relies on too few sources	Demonstrates a reasonable awareness of the literature	Demonstrates broad awareness and situates capstone work within the relevant literature	Makes a contribution to the field, or identifies a new direction for investigation while situating capstone work within the relevant literature
Understanding and use of anthropological scholarship	Demonstrates little or no understanding of anthropological scholarship relevant to the research topic / question(s)	Demonstrates some understanding; may include misunderstandings or miss important elements of cited scholarship	Demonstrates solid understanding and use in the original analysis of phenomena under study	Provides fresh, new insights about connection between relevant anthropological scholarship and topic; situates topic contextually in an original way
Synthesizing of scholarly works and concepts	Does not appropriately cite anthropological scholarship and concepts	Cites appropriate scholarship and concepts but in a list-like fashion, with no or little synthesis	Appropriately cites and synthesizes concepts with good connections made to research topic	Synthesizes concepts in an original way, providing new insights and making contributions to the field
Thesis Argument(s)	Weak, invalid or no argument; perhaps a simple assertion	Some arguments valid and well-supported, some not	Main argument(s) valid, systematic and well-supported	Argument(s) both well-supported and compared to related and conflicting scholarly arguments
Use of anthropological theory to support argument(s)	No or little reference to relevant anthropological theory in development of argument(s)	Some reference to anthropological theory but weak connections made to argument(s), may include misunderstandings or miss important elements of the cited theory	Good use of anthropological theory in the development of argument(s) with good connections made and solid understanding of cited theory	Strong use of theory to support original argument(s) and proposes new theory or new ways of approaching existing theories.

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Organization of project paper/presentation	Poor organization: ideas do not flow logically from beginning to end, no narrative arc	Weak organization: some flow but it is inconsistent across the paper/presentation as a whole; some sections are better organized than others	Good organization: Flow and narrative arc are generally good, not interfering with "following the story"	Excellent organization: Flow and narrative arc are flawlessly smooth and contribute to development of thesis argument(s)