## Argumentative Writing Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5
Ideas	<ul> <li>Unclear what side of the argument is being supported</li> <li>The other side not brought up</li> <li>Flawed interpretation of information</li> <li>Few details, facts, or examples; reads like a list</li> <li>Missing or little evidence of strengths or weaknesses for either side</li> <li>Often strays off topic</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Mostly aligns with one side of the argument</li> <li>Part of the other side is represented</li> <li>Accurately Interprets some information</li> <li>Includes some variety of facts, details, and examples</li> <li>Varies on strengths and weaknesses for both sides</li> <li>Occasionally strays off topic</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Aligns with one side of the argument</li> <li>Two sides are represented</li> <li>Accurately Interprets information</li> <li>Includes multiple facts, details, and examples</li> <li>Strengths and weaknesses are included for both sides</li> <li>Stays on topic throughout</li> </ul>
Organization	<ul> <li>Introduction has no position statement and has vague or missing background information</li> <li>Transitions intrusive with little variety</li> <li>Little or no evidence to order of argument</li> <li>Conclusion missing or vaguely reminds reader of what's at stake</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Introduction has an unclear position statement and/or partial background information</li> <li>Transitions vary from simple to sophisticated</li> <li>Order of arguments shows some thought</li> <li>Conclusion somewhat reminds readers what's at stake</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Introduction includes clear position statement and background information</li> <li>All transitions are sophisticated</li> <li>Order of arguments strengthens the writing</li> <li>Conclusion reminds readers what's at stake</li> </ul>
Voice	<ul> <li>Tone is more opinion using 1<sup>st</sup> person</li> <li>Sounds more emotional than factual In understanding</li> <li>Seems to be addressing a specific audience</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Drifts between subjective/opinion and objective/factual tone using mixed point of view</li> <li>Sounds more general in understanding</li> <li>Varies between general and specific audience</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Maintains an objective/factual tone using 3<sup>rd</sup> person</li> <li>Sounds like an official expert</li> <li>Addresses a general audience</li> </ul>
Word Choice	Weak word choice     Little or no cohesion		<ul><li>Appropriate word choice</li><li>Creates some cohesion</li></ul>		<ul> <li>Rich, sophisticated word choice</li> <li>Creates cohesion (smoothly ties ideas together)</li> </ul>
Sentence Fluency	Choppy to read     Little or no variety of lengths and structures of sentences     Little variety in sentence openers		<ul> <li>Inconsistent flow of reading</li> <li>Uses some variety of lengths and structures to somewhat enhance meaning</li> <li>Uses some variety of sentence openers</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Reads smoothly</li> <li>Uses a variety of lengths and structures to enhance meaning and adds to sophistication</li> <li>Uses sophisticated sentence openers such as prepositional phrases, clauses, modifiers, participles</li> </ul>
Conventions	Errors interfere with meaning		Partial interference with meaning		Errors do not interfere with meaning