

At-A-Glance Rubric *Argumentative Writing*

	Development of Ideas	Organization	Style	Word Choice	Sentence Structure	Conventions
5	The response is strongly focused and complete, with a wealth of appropriate information and details. The writer introduces a claim, clearly states an opinion/takes a position, provides sufficient and convincing support using facts and details to fully develop the composition, as well as strategies and elaborative techniques appropriate to the task, purpose and audience. All main ideas in the response are uniformly developed and the support strongly enhances cohesion. The writer may take creative approaches that enhance the response.	The response has a strong vertical and horizontal structure. The organization is specific to task, purpose and audience. The response moves smoothly from purposeful introduction to effective conclusion. Effective transitions contribute to unity. Transitions may be transparent and do not interfere with the flow of ideas. There is a strong progression of ideas from sentence to sentence and introduction to conclusion.	The writer personalizes the topic and forms a strong connection with the audience by demonstrating a strong sense of purpose and appropriateness to task and audience. The writer's voice comes through the composition and strengthens the connection with the audience. Compositional risks are successful and enhance the response. The communication with the audience is strong without seeming forced. The writer establishes and maintains a formal style.	Words are used in a precise and sophisticated way to enhance the development of the topic. The response has evidence of precise vocabulary that is beyond grade level. Word selection strongly enhances specificity of support and elaboration. Words have impact and are used with efficiency. The writer's choice of words effectively brings the response to life.	Sentences in the response are complex and varied. Sentence construction contributes to a strong sense of fluency. Attempts at sophistication are successful. Combinations of sentence structures enhance cohesion and promote strong expression. There are no errors in sentence construction.	The response demonstrates command of the standard conventions of English grammar, usage, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation.
4	The response is focused and reasonably complete, with appropriate information and details. The writer introduces a claim states an opinion/takes a position, and provides sufficient specific support to develop the composition, using strategies and techniques appropriate to the task, purpose and audience. Reasons and supporting details may not be convincing. All reasons are supported but development may be uneven. Support enhances cohesion.	The response has a reasonably strong vertical and horizontal structure. The response is generally appropriate to task, purpose and audience. The response moves somewhat smoothly from beginning to conclusion. Some effective transitions are evident that contribute to unity. Transitions may be obvious but they do not interfere with the flow of ideas. There is a progression of ideas from sentence to sentence and introduction to conclusion.	The writer forms a reasonably successful connection with the audience and has awareness of purpose. There is evidence of voice and awareness of the audience. Compositional risks, if evident, are reasonably successful. The communication with the audience is evident and does not seem forced. The writer establishes and maintains a generally formal style.	Words enhance the development of the topic. The response may have evidence of vocabulary that is beyond grade level. Word selection enhances specificity of support and elaboration. Words are well chosen and are used somewhat efficiently. The writer's choice of words brings the response to life.	Sentences in the response are varied. Sentence construction contributes to fluency. Attempts at sophistication are for the most part successful. Combinations of sentence structures are evident and ease reading. There are few errors in sentence construction.	The response demonstrates mostly adequate command of the standard conventions of English grammar, usage, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation.
3	The response is focused and somewhat complete, with sufficient appropriate information and details to support the topic. The claim, position, or opinion may be unclear. Development is uneven, with a mix of general and specific details. Reasons and details may lack logic or support. Support somewhat enhances cohesion.	The response has a basic vertical and horizontal structure. The response is somewhat appropriate to task, purpose and audience. The response moves from introduction to conclusion but may have some interruptions. Some transitions are evident, but they may be artificial and interfere somewhat with the flow of ideas. There is a progression of ideas from introduction to conclusion, but sentence-to-sentence cohesion may be lacking.	The writer's connection with the audience and purpose is uneven. The response may be mundane and lack voice. Compositional risks, if evident, are only partially successful. The writer may not demonstrate awareness of the audience or the writing may seem somewhat artificial. The writing may show an uneven use of formal style.	Words are adequate to develop the topic. There are few words that are beyond grade level. Word selection is a mix of general and specific and may not enhance support and elaboration. Wordiness may be evident as the writer tries to relate ideas. The writer's choice of words may be mundane.	Sentences in the response are only occasionally varied. Sentence construction is repetitive and mechanical. Attempts at sophistication are not evident. Combinations of sentence structures are lacking. Awkward sentences create some minor interruptions. Awkward sentences create some minor interruptions.	The response demonstrates partial command of the standard conventions of English grammar, usage, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation.
2	The response is weakly focused and lacks development. The claim may be unclear or absent. The writer may not state an opinion/take a position. Details may be general, vague, or inappropriate. The response has very little or no support and may display minimal writing. Cohesion may be lacking.	The response is flawed structurally and disorganized. The response lacks specificity as to task, purpose and/or audience. The response may have insufficient writing to organize. Transitions may be missing or inappropriate. The progression of ideas from beginning to end is disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas.	The writer's connection with the audience and purpose is weak. The response has a weak awareness of the audience and lacks voice. The response is pedestrian and may be formulaic. Any reaching out to the audience is disruptive to the flow of the response. The response may have insufficient writing to develop a connection with the audience. The writing lacks a formal style.	Words are not adequate to develop the topic. Vocabulary is basic and may be inaccurate. Word selection is primarily general. Wordiness and repetition disrupt the flow of ideas. The response may have insufficient writing to indicate adequate word choice.	Sentence construction in the response is elemental. The response consists of simple structures. Awkward sentences create interruptions. There are errors in sentence construction, including run-ons, fragments, and on-and-ons, that seriously disrupt the presentation. The response may insufficient writing to evaluate sentence structure.	The response demonstrates minimal command of the standard conventions of English grammar, usage, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation.
1	The response lacks focus and development. The writer does not state a claim nor take a position. Details are minimal. The response may be confusing and may display minimal writing. Ideas may be presented randomly.	The response is seriously disorganized. The response may have insufficient writing to organize. Transitions may be confusing. The progression of ideas from introduction to conclusion is seriously disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas.	The writer demonstrates little to no sense of the audience or the purpose of the topic. The response is disconnected from the topic and may have vague or random ideas. The response may be difficult for the audience to understand. The response may have insufficient writing to develop a connection with the audience.	Words are not adequate to develop the topic and may be incorrect. Vocabulary is basic and may be confusing to the audience. Word selection is general and vague. Wordiness and repetition disrupt the flow of ideas. The response may have insufficient writing to indicate adequate word choice.	Sentences in the response are simple and errors create confusion. Command of sentences is still emerging. The response consists of simple structures. Awkward sentences create confusion and require deciphering on the part of the audience. There are errors in sentence construction, including run-ons and fragments that seriously disrupt the response. The response may have insufficient writing to evaluate sentence structure.	The response demonstrates no command of the standard conventions of English grammar, usage, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation.