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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Argumentative Essay Rubric for High School Students** | | | | | |
| Score | Statement of Purpose/Focus | Organization | Elaboration 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 intro 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 little depth:  --evidence form 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 brief  --may have a major drift  --claim may be confusing or ambiguous | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure  --few or no transitions  --frequent extraneous ideas | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details: | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions |
| 0 | 0===No evidence of the ability to meet objectives | 0===No evidence of the ability to meet objectives | 0===No evidence of the ability to meet objectives | 0===No evidence of the ability to meet objectives | 0===No evidence of the ability to meet objectives |