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| **Argumentation Writing Rubric** |
| **Score** | **Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization** | **Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence** | **Conventions** |
| **Purpose/Focus** | **Organization** | **Elaboration of Evidence** | **Language & Vocabulary** |
| **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 introduction 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, & 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 details, and achieves little depth: * evidence from 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 be very brief
* may have a major drift
* claim may be confusing or ambiguous
 | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure: * few or no transitional strategies are evident
* frequent extraneous ideas may intrude
 | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details: * use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant
 | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing: * uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary
* may have little sense of audience and purpose
 | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions: * errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure
 |
| **0** | A response gets no credit if it provides no evidence of the ability to respond to the writing task.  |