



## **ClearSight Grades 9–10 and 11–12 Argumentative Rubric**

This rubric provides the scoring criteria for the Argumentative writing prompts in grades 9 through 12 that occur in the Checkpoint and Interim forms. The writing prompt item is worth a total of 10 points with those points being distributed across three categories of scoring criteria—Conventions (worth a maximum 2 points), Elaboration (worth a maximum 4 points), and Organization (worth a maximum 4 points).

These writing prompts assess the following Common Core State Standards:

**Domain:**

W: Writing Standards.

**Cluster:**

W|9–10.A, 11–12.A: Text Types and Purposes.

**Standards:**

W.9–10.1a: Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence: Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.

W.11–12.1a: Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence: Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.

## ClearSight Grades 9–10 and 11–12 Argumentative Rubric (cont.)

	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
<b>Organization (4 points)</b>	<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 purpose, audience, and task</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>alternate or opposing claims are included but may not be completely addressed</li> <li>context provided for the claim is adequate within the purpose, audience, and task</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 and unfocused</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>	<p>Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing</p>
	<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 to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</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 to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</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>	

## ClearSight Grades 9–10 and 11–12 Argumentative Rubric (cont.)

	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
<b>Elaboration (4 points)</b>	<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 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 provides adequate support/evidence for the 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 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 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 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 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> <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>	<p>Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing</p>
<b>Conventions (2 points)</b>	N/A	N/A	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some errors in usage and sentence formation are 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 lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• errors in usage may obscure meaning</li> <li>• inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing</p>