

## ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING RUBRIC

	<b>FOCUS/CLAIMS:</b> <b>Make purposeful and focused claim(s), that sustains a direct response to the prompt and that logically sequences ideas that support claim(s)</b>	<b>EVIDENCE/ANALYSIS:</b> <b>Integrate ideas and evidence from diverse sources that support a coherent answer to a question</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION:</b> <b>organizational structure, creating unity and completeness</b>	<b>CONVENTIONS:</b> <b>demonstrates a command of conventions</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b> <b>Exceeds the Standard</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The response is fully sustained. It consistently and purposefully focused.</li> <li>-Thesis (main claim) is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained through the use of claim sentences (reasons) and quality concluding sentences. It directly and clearly answer all elements of the prompt</li> <li>-Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end. Strong connections among ideas</li> <li>- Thesis is introduced and communicated clearly within the context of the prompt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The written response cites plenty of textual evidence (quoted excerpts or paraphrased) from a variety of sources supported by a thorough analysis of what the texts says explicitly, as well as inferences drawn from the texts.</li> <li>- The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer’s thesis (main claim) and supporting claims. The evidence selected from sources is smoothly integrated, relevant, and concrete (specific)</li> <li>- plenty of MLA parenthetical citations are used to cite evidence (and ALL are formatted properly)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes a well-developed intro and conclusion that appropriately set up themes and topic</li> <li>- effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies</li> <li>- The response has a clear and effective organizational structure. Consistently demonstrates a clear and logical plan of organization</li> </ul>	<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 (grammar) and sentence formation</li> <li>- effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.</li> </ul> <p>Effective sentence fluency</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b> <b>Meets the Standard</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The response is adequately sustained and generally focused.</li> <li>- Thesis (main claim) is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present or direct response to the prompt may be limited</li> <li>-Most (not necessarily all) topic sentences are claims that sustain the thesis</li> <li>- Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end. Adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The written response cites sufficient textual evidence (quoted excerpts or paraphrased) from a limited variety of sources to support an analysis of what the texts says explicitly, (and may include inferences drawn from the text).</li> <li>-The response provides evidence/support for the writers thesis (main claim) and supporting claims. The few sources selected are adequately integrated, the response achieves some depth and specificity but is often general in nature:</li> <li>- a sufficient number of MLA parenthetical citations are used to cite evidence, although some may be inconsistent or imprecise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes satisfactory intro and conclusion that sets up basic themes/ideas</li> <li>- adequate use of transitional strategies, with some variety</li> <li>- Demonstrates a clear and logical plan of organization</li> <li>- The response has a clear organizational structure though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some errors in usage (grammar) and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed</li> <li>- adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> <li>- Adequate but not consistent sentence fluency</li> </ul>

<p><b>2</b> <b>Approaching the Standard</b></p>	<p>-The response is somewhat sustained and may have a drift in focus or may not provide clear response to the prompt.</p> <p>-May be clearly focused on the thesis (main claim) but is insufficiently sustained (multiple topic sentences are not clearly stated claim topic sentences)</p> <p>-Conversely, thesis (main claim on the issue) may be somewhat unclear and unfocused.</p> <p>-Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end. Weak connection among ideas</p>	<p>The written response provides uneven, cursory textual evidence (quoted excerpts or paraphrased) from a limited number of source or in some cases only 1 source, to support a very generalized analysis of the texts used . It includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details.</p> <p>The response achieves little depth and provided limited evidence/support for the writers thesis (main claim) and supporting claim. The evidence from sources is weakly integrated and inconsistently relevant or concrete (specific)</p> <p>too few MLA parenthetical citations are used to cite evidence or in some cases there are no cited evidence at all</p>	<p>-introduction and / or conclusion, if present, are weak do not relate to topic and/or are confusing, should be revised</p> <p>- inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies, with little variety</p> <p>- The response has an inconsistent organizational structure and flaws make it difficult to follow</p>	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- frequent errors in usage (grammar) may obscure meaning</li> <li>- Grammatical and spelling errors throughout</li> <li>- noticeably inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> <li>-Limited to no sentence fluency</li> </ul>
<p><b>1</b> <b>Does not meet the Standard</b></p>	<p>-The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little or no focus (or little relevant detail)</p> <p>- May be very brief and unrelated to the nature of the prompt being answered</p> <p>- May have a major drift in ideas thesis (main claim) may be confusing or ambiguous</p> <p>-Most topic sentences are not claim topic sentences (reasons) that explain or advance the Argument</p> <p>- Frequent extraneous ideas may intrude, making the paper difficult to follow. Limited to no connection of ideas to the prompt</p>	<p>-The response provides minimal or no textual evidence and a very limited analysis of the information used. It includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details.</p> <p>-The response has no depth and provides no support for the writer’s thesis (main claim) and supporting claim. Any evidence used is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant</p> <p>- there may be no MLA parenthetical citations in the paper</p>	<p>- lacks a introduction and / or conclusion</p> <p>- few or no basic transitional strategies are evident</p> <p>- The response has little or no discernible organizational structure evident</p>	<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-errors in usage, sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization and spelling are frequent and obscure meaning on multiple occasions</li> <li>- Considerable grammatical and spelling errors</li> <li>- lacking all sentence fluency</li> </ul>

**STANDARDS ADDRESSED**

**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.WHST.9-10.1** - Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content.

**Common Core Reading #1** - Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.

**Common Core Reading #6** - Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.

**Common Core Reading #9** - Compare and contrast treatments of the same topic in several primary and secondary sources.

**Oregon HS.61** - Analyze an event, issue, problem, or phenomenon, identifying characteristics, influences, causes, and both short- and long-term effects.

**Oregon HS.12** - Construct and defend a written historical argument using relevant primary and secondary sources as evidence.