# The Flame Literary Journal Argumentative Writing Rubric

| Score | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | | Conventions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Statement of Purpose/Focus | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary | |
| **4** | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused: <br>• claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained <br>• alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed* <br>• claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness: <br>• effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies <br>• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end <br>• effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose <br>• strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety | 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: <br>• use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete <br>• effective use of a variety of elaborative | The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language: <br>• use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions: <br>• few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation <br>• effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| **3** | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused: <br>• claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present <br>• context provided for the claim is adequate | 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: <br>• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety <br>• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end <br>• adequate introduction and conclusion <br>• adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | The response provides adequate support/evidence for writer's claim that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves some depth and specificity but is predominantly general: <br>• some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise <br>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques | The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language: <br>• use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions: <br>• some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed <br>• adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| **2** | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus: <br>• may be clearly focused on the claim but is insufficiently sustained <br>• claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident: <br>• inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety <br>• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end <br>• conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak <br>• weak connection among ideas | 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: <br>• evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven <br>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques | The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language: <br>• use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions: <br>• frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning <br>• inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| **1** | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail: <br>• may be very brief <br>• may have a major drift <br>• claim may be confusing or ambiguous | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure: <br>• few or no transitional strategies are evident <br>• frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details: <br>• use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant | The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing: <br>• uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary <br>• may have little sense of audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions: <br>• errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure |