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

**Argument Writing Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent-4** | **Proficient-3** | **Developing-2** | **Not present-1** |
| Statement ofPurpose/Focus | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:-Clam is focused, clearly stated, and strongly maintained-Alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed-Claim is introduced and 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 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-logical progression of ideas from beginning to the end-effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose-strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic 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 progression of ideas 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 |
| Elaborationof Evidence | The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer’s claim that included effective sources, facts and details. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant:-use of evident from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete-effect use of a variety of elaborative techniques | The response provides adequate support/evidence for the 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 source 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 included 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 expresses ion 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:-a few, if any, errors are present is 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 |