

## Grades 6-11 Argument Rubric

(Adapted from Smarter Balanced Writing Rubrics at <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/smarter-balanced-assessments/>)

	4	3	2	1
Statement of Purpose/Focus	<p>The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained</li> <li>alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed*</li> <li>claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context</li> </ul>	<p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present</li> <li>context provided for the claim is adequate</li> </ul>	<p>The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may be clearly focused on the claim but is insufficiently sustained</li> <li>claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear</li> </ul>	<p>The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may be very brief</li> <li>may have a major drift</li> <li>claim may be confusing or ambiguous</li> </ul>
Organization	<p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies</li> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose</li> <li>strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety</li> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li>adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety</li> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak</li> <li>weak connection among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may intrude</li> </ul>
Elaboration of Evidence	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant</li> </ul>
Language and Vocabulary	<p>The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary</li> <li>may have little sense of audience and purpose</li> </ul>
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation</li> <li>effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed</li> <li>adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning</li> <li>inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>errors are frequent and severe</li> <li>meaning is often obscure</li> </ul>

Remember to scale rubric scores according to the school grade scale. The table below is an example.

Total	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
%	100	97.5	95	92.5	90	87.5	85	82.5	80	77.5	75	72.5	70	67.5	65	62.5	60

(Holly Olszewski, 2013)

## Grades 6-11 Informative/Explanatory Rubric

(Adapted from Smarter Balanced Writing Rubrics at <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/smarter-balanced-assessments/>)

	4	3	2	1
Statement of Purpose/Focus	<p>The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>controlling idea or main idea of a topic is focused, clearly stated, and strongly maintained</li> <li>controlling idea or main idea of a topic is introduced and communicated clearly within the context</li> </ul>	<p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focus is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present</li> <li>some context for the controlling idea or main idea of the topic is adequate</li> </ul>	<p>The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may be clearly focused on the controlling or main idea, but is insufficiently sustained</li> <li>controlling idea or main idea may be unclear and somewhat unclear</li> </ul>	<p>The response may be related to the topic but may provide little or no focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may be very brief</li> <li>may have a major drift</li> <li>focus may be confusing or ambiguous</li> </ul>
Organization	<p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of a variety of transitional strategies</li> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose</li> <li>strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety</li> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li>adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety</li> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak</li> <li>weak connection among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may intrude</li> </ul>
Elaboration of Evidence	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, and concrete</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes the use of sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of evidence from the source material is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant</li> </ul>
Language and Vocabulary	<p>The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of domain-specific vocabulary that may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<p>The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary</li> <li>may have little sense of audience and purpose</li> </ul>
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation</li> <li>effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed</li> <li>adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning</li> <li>inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure</li> </ul>

\*Remember to scale rubric scores according to the school grade scale. The table below is an example.

Total	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
%	100	97.5	95	92.5	90	87.5	85	82.5	80	77.5	75	72.5	70	67.5	65	62.5	60

(Holly Olszewski, 2013)