SVHS Argumentative Writing Rubric (Grades 9-12) revissed 10.14.15 (Items in parenthesis are SVHS examples)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCORE** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Statement**  **of**  **Purpose/Focus** | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:   * Claim (thesis statement) is clearly stated, focused, and strongly maintained * Alternate or opposing claims (opponent’s viewpoints) are clearly addressed * Claim is introduced/communicated clearly within the context | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:   * Claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present * Context provided for the claim is adequate | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:   * May be clearly focused on the claim, but is insufficiently sustained * Claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused | The response may be related to the purpose, but may offer little relevant detail:   * May be very brief * May have a major drift * Claim may be confusing or ambiguous |
| **Organization** | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:   * Effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies (first, however, on the other hand) * Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end * Effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose (thought-provoking) * Strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety (sentence variety) | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:   * Adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety * Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end * Adequate introduction and conclusion * Adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:   * Inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety * Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end * Conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak * Weak connection among ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:   * Few or no transitional strategies are evident * Frequent extraneous ideas may intrude |
| **Elaboration**  **of**  **Evidence** | The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant:   * Use of evidence from sources (in text citations) is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete * Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques (facts, data, examples, definitions, direct quotes, etc.) | The response provides adequate support/evidence for writer’s claim that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves some depth and specificity, but is predominantly general:   * Some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise * Adequate use of some elaborative techniques | The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details, and achieves little depth:   * Evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven * Weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:   * Use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant |
| **Language**  **and**  **Vocabulary** | The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:   * Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:   * Use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:   * Use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:   * Uses limited language or domain- specific vocabulary * May have little sense of audience and purpose |
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:   * Few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation * Effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:   * Some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed * Adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:   * Frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning * Inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:   * Errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure |
| **Primary**  **Traits** |  |  |  |  |

**Comments: TOTAL: /20**