

## Grades 6-12 Argumentative 10-point Rubric

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ /10

Grades 6-12 Argumentative 10-point Rubric						
4		3	2	1		
Purpose/Organization	<p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> effective introduction and conclusion</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>		<p>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged*</li> </ul>	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged*</li> </ul>	4
	Evidence/Elaboration	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> insightful, accurate content and/or analysis</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> clear citations or attribution to source material</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>		<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> accurate content and/or analysis</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> some accurate content and/or analysis</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> weak or inaccurate content and/or minimal analysis</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>
2		1		0		
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>		<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>		<p>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	2

\*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view—counterargument—begins at Grade 7.

(Based on SBAC rubrics)

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).

NS ~ No Score: unintelligible; in a language other than English; off-topic; copied text; off-purpose (Off-purpose responses still receive a score in Conventions.)

**Conventions Holistic Scoring:**

**Variety:** A range of errors includes formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.

**Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.

**Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.