| Score | Generic 4-point Argumentative Writing Rubric (Grade 6-11) Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | | |
|-------|--|--|--|---|--|
| | Statement of | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary | Conventions |
| | Purpose/Focus | Organization | Liaboration of Evidence | Language and vocabulary | Conventions |
| 4 | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused: claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed* claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness: • effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end • effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose • strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | 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 is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete - effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques | 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 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 |
| 3 | 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 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 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 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 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 |
| 2 | 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 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 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 expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language: use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions: • frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning • inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| 1 | 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 | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure: • few or no transitional strategies are evident • frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | 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 | 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 | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions: errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure |