



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
Organization (4 points)	<p>The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is clearly stated, focused, and strongly maintained alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the purpose, audience, and task 	<p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present alternate or opposing claims are included but may not be completely addressed context provided for the claim is adequate within the purpose, audience, and task 	<p>The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be clearly focused on the claim but is insufficiently sustained claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused 	<p>The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be very brief may have a major drift claim may be confusing or ambiguous 	<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"> effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas logical progression of ideas from beginning to end effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety 	<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"> adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify the relationships between and among ideas adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end adequate introduction and conclusion adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas 	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> few or no transitional strategies are evident frequent extraneous ideas may intrude 	

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

	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Elaboration (4 points)	<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"> • use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete • effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques <p>The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose 	<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"> • some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise • adequate use of some elaborative techniques <p>The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose 	<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"> • evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven • weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques <p>The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose 	<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"> • use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant <p>The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary • may have little sense of audience and purpose 	<p>Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing</p>
Conventions (2 points)	N/A	N/A	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some errors in usage and sentence formation are present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed • adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling 	<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • errors in usage may obscure meaning • inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling 	<p>Insufficient, illegible, foreign language, incoherent, off-topic, or off-purpose writing</p>