|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TOK ESSAY Rubric - Does the student present an appropriate and cogent analysis of knowledge questions in discussing the title?** | | | | | | |
| Aspect | Level 5  9–10 | Level 4  7–8 | Level 3 5–6 | Level 2 3–4 | Level 1  1–2 | 0 |
| Understanding knowledge questions | There is a *sustained focus* on **knowledge questions** connected to the prescribed title—**developed** with *investigation* of **different perspectives** and **linked** *effectively* to **areas of knowledge** and/or **ways of knowing**. | There is a *focus* on **knowledge questions** *connected* to the prescribed title—**developed** with *acknowledgment* of **different perspectives** and **linked** to **areas of knowledge** and/or **ways of knowing**. | There is a *focus* on *some* **knowledge questions** *connected* to the prescribed title—with *some* **development** and **linking** to **areas of knowledge** and/or **ways of knowing**. | *Some* **knowledge questions** that are *connected* to the prescribed title are considered, but the essay is largely *descriptive*, with *superficial or limited* **links** to **areas of knowledge** and/or **ways of knowing**. | **Knowledge questions**, where present, are weakly connected to the prescribed title—the essay is *descriptive*. | The essay does not reach a standard described by levels 1–5 or is not a response to one of the prescribed titles on the list for the current session. |
| Quality of analysis of knowledge questions | **Arguments** are *clear*, supported by **real-life examples** and are *effectively evaluated*; **counterclaims** are extensively *explored*; **implications** are *drawn.* | Arguments are *clear*, supported by **real-life examples** and are *evaluated*; some **counterclaims** are identified and *explored*. | *Some* **arguments** are *clear* and supported by **examples**; some **counterclaims** are *identified.* | Arguments are offered but are *unclear* and/or *not supported* by *effective* **examples**. | **Assertions** are offered but are *not supported*. |
| **Some possible characteristics** | | | | | | |
|  | Cogent  Accomplished  Discerning  Individual  Lucid  Insightful  Compelling | Pertinent  Relevant  Thoughtful  Analytical  Organized  Credible  Coherent | Typical  Acceptable  Mainstream  Adequate  Competent | Underdeveloped  Basic  Superficial  Derivative  Rudimentary  Limited | Ineffective  Descriptive  Incoherent  Formless |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TOK ESSAY Rubric SIMPLIFIED** - Does the student present an appropriate and cogent analysis of knowledge questions in discussing the title? | | | | | |
| Aspect | Level 5  9–10 | Level 4  7–8 | Level 3 5–6 | Level 2 3–4 | Level 1  1–2 |
| Understanding knowledge questions | * KQs   + Sustained focus   + Connected to PT * Investigate different perspectives * Effectively linked to Aok and/or WoK | * KQs   + Focused on   + Connected to PT   + Developed * Acknowledge different perspectives * Linked to Aok and/or WoK | * KQs   + Connected to PT   + Some development * Linked to AoK and/or Wok | * KQs   + Descriptive / Superficial * Limited connection to AOK or WOK | * *KQs*   + Weak connection to Title * Descriptive |
| Quality of analysis of knowledge questions | * *Arguments*   + *clear*   + *Supported by RLS examples*   + *Effectively Evaluated* * *Counterclaims extensively explored* * *Implication drawn* | * *Arguments*   + *clear*   + *Supported by RLS examples*   + *Evaluated* * *Counterclaims identified*   + *Explored* | * *Arguments*   + *Some are clear*   + *Supported by examples* * *Counterclaims identified* | * Arguments   + Unclear / not supported   + No effective examples | * Assertions   + Not supported |

Assertions: Knowledge Claims / statement of fact or belief.

Clear: applicable and understandable of connection to topic

Counterclaims: claim stating the opposite point of view. Not necessarily total negation, but simply another way of viewing something

Descriptive: merely describing the KQ and/or RLS with no additional analysis

Development: showing positives and negatives of more than one possibility - use of 4-square -/+ grid

Different Perspectives: try to consider how those looking from a different perspective might view the KQs in your essay. Ex: Gender, Geographical location, Religion/philosophical position, Historical era, Language, Cultural tradition, Socio-economic position, Educational system, Profession or career

Evaluated: positives and negatives of position given to show holistic perspective

Examples: used to explore claims and counterclaims. Can be both shared &/or personal knowledge. Usually academic in nature. AVOID Hypothetical, anecdotal, and clichéd example

Explored: positive and negatives perspective considered. Subject evaluated from many perspective and angles. NOT superficial

Focused: all writing, claims, and examples are directly connected to PT. Concise and direct writing with no fluff

Implications Drawn: explicitly stating why your arguments are important. Emphasize on argument’s significance and demonstrate awareness of this through application beyond argument (ex: in world or society in general). Can be done effectively though different perspectives

Knowledge Question (KQ): a question, or issue, about knowledge. Open questions, which means that they don’t have obvious and clearly-defined answers, and can be interpreted differently depending on the perspective you view them from.

Linked to AoK / WoK: KQ, development, and examples refer directly to HOW WE KNOW in a specific Area of Knowledge or Way of Knowing.

Prescribed Title (PT): set of 6 question IB gives for TOK Essay. If not writing the TOK Essay, PT can also be considered your topic or the main KQ you are writing about

Superficial: existing or occurring at or on the surface. Lacking in depth. Option without support or eviden