Argumentative Writing Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Focus** | **Organization** | **Support** | **Conventions** |
| **3 – Meets Expectations** | Introduces a clear and **arguable claim and counterclaim(s)**.  Writing is appropriate to task, purpose **(argument),** and audience. | Recognizable introduction and conclusion; transitions link ideas and create cohesion; logic to the order of events/ideas. | **Claim is well supported with valid and sufficient evidence. Claim and counterclaim(s) are developed**. **Reasoning for evidence is included.** Disciplinary vocabulary and content is relevant and accurate. Textual evidence included as support **if appropriate.** | Few errors that do not detract from the message. |
| **2- Approaches Expectations** | Introduces a **claim**.  Writing shows some consideration of appropriateness of to task, purpose (**argument**), audience. | Introduction or conclusion present and recognizable; few transitions; order of events/ ideas seems unclear. | **Claim is not well supported. Claim and counterclaim(s) are presented but not well supported.** **Reasoning for claim is presented but not well justified.** Minimal use of accurate and relevant disciplinary vocabulary or content. Little text evidence included **even when appropriate.** | Several errors that are somewhat distracting. |
| **1 – Not Yet** | Names a topic.  Writing lacks consideration of task, purpose (**argument**), and audience. | No real lead to set up what follows; no effective conclusion to wrap things up; connections between ideas/ paragraphs confusing or absent; unclear order of events/ideas. | **Claim and/or counterclaim(s) not adequately supported**. **Lacks reasoning**. Lacks accurate and relevant disciplinary vocabulary or content.  **Lacks text evidence.** | A significant number of errors that detract from the message. |