

ARGUMENT ESSAY RUBRIC - 4 POINT SCALE

	4	3	2	1
<b>Focus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response is consistently and purposefully focused</li> <li>-claim is given context, clearly introduced, strongly maintained, and paraphrased in the conclusion</li> <li>-counter-claim(s) skillfully and clearly acknowledged and addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response is generally focused; writing unified</li> <li>-claim is clear and for the most part maintained</li> <li>-adequate context provided for the claim</li> <li>-claim is paraphrased in the conclusion</li> <li>-counter-claim(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-may have a minor drift in focus</li> <li>-claim may be clearly stated but insufficiently sustained</li> <li>-counter-claim(s) inadequately presented or addressed; may be confusing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response may be very brief or may have a major drift in focus</li> <li>-claim may be confusing or ambiguous</li> <li>-counter-claim(s) missing</li> </ul>
<b>Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response is unified by a clear and effective organizational structure</li> <li>-effective and consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies with logical progression of ideas</li> <li>-strong introduction and conclusion</li> <li>-strong connections among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response has an evident organizational structure with adequate introduction and conclusion, though some ideas may be loosely connected</li> <li>-adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety</li> <li>-adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident</li> <li>-inconsistent use of basic transition strategies</li> <li>-weak connection among ideas</li> <li>-uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>-conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response has little or no clear organizational structure</li> <li>-few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>-extraneous ideas may intrude</li> </ul>
<b>Details &amp; Elaboration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer's claim including the effective use of researched facts and quotes</li> <li>-use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, relevant, and concrete</li> <li>-effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response provides accurate and relevant support/evidence for writer's claim that includes the use of researched facts and quotes</li> <li>-evidence from sources is integrated, even if awkwardly</li> <li>-adequate elaboration of evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response provides uneven support/evidence for the writer's claim (may include partial or uneven use of facts and quotes)</li> <li>-evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, may be weak or too general</li> <li>-uneven use of elaborative techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's claim; little or no researched facts/quotes</li> <li>-use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant</li> </ul>
<b>Voice &amp; Tone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language (academic and <i>domain-specific</i>* vocabulary)</li> <li>-uses an authoritative and informed tone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-response adequately expresses ideas with a mix of precise and more general language</li> <li>-uses some <i>domain-specific</i>* vocabulary correctly</li> <li>-generally conveys a tone of authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-expresses ideas unevenly</li> <li>-limited use of <i>domain-specific</i>* vocabulary</li> <li>-informed or authoritative tone is inconsistent but evident in some areas of the response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing</li> <li>-little <i>domain-specific</i>* vocabulary</li> <li>-lacks authoritative tone</li> </ul>
<b>Conventions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-strong command of conventions; few, if any, errors are present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-grade level control over conventions; errors do not significantly distract</li> <li>-paragraphing and indentations are correct</li> <li>-greater attention to detail needed in:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formatting punctuation capitalization spelling sentence structure or run ons</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-some control of GUMS; frequent errors are distracting or confusing</li> <li>-systematic errors evident in:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formatting punctuation capitalization spelling sentence structure or run ons</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-serious or numerous errors distract or lead to confusion</li> </ul>

\**domain-specific* means vocabulary that is consistently used in the research about the issue