

**4-Point  
Argumentative  
Writing Rubric**

Score	4	3	2	1	NS
<b>Purpose/Organization</b>	<p><b>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task</li> <li>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>effective introduction and conclusion</li> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>	<p><b>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. The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task</li> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident. The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose, audience, and task</li> <li>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</li> <li>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</li> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged*</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose, audience, or task</li> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</li> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>Explicit refusal</li> <li>Statement of non-understanding</li> <li>Predominately in another language</li> </ul>

\*While infrequent, it is possible an argument may not have a counter-claim e.g. bullying, argument of value (Frieda Kahlo is the most influential Mexican painter). See George Hillocks work.

**4-Point  
Argumentative  
Writing Rubric**

Score	4	3	2	1	NS
<b>Evidence/Elaboration</b>	<p><b>The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes reasoned analysis and the effective use of facts and details. The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive support is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response provides adequate support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes reasoned analysis and the use of facts and details. The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate support is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of facts and details. The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques; development may rely on emotional appeal*</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes little or no use of facts and details. The response's expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques; emotional appeal may dominate*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>Explicit refusal</li> <li>Statement of non-understanding</li> <li>Predominately in another language</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s). Elaborative techniques include logical, ethical, and emotional appeal.

**2-Point  
Argumentative  
Writing Rubric**

Score	2	1	0	NS
<b>Conventions</b>	<p><b>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p><b>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>Explicit refusal</li> <li>Statement of non-understanding</li> <li>Predominately in another language</li> </ul>

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.