## The Flame Literary Journal Argumentative Writing Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization</th>
<th>Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence</th>
<th>Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | The response is fully sustained and consistently focused:  
* claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained  
* alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed  
* claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context  
* supports/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:  
* use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete  
* effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques  | 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:  
* use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete  
* effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques  | The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:  
* use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose  |
| 3     | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:  
* claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present  
* context provided for the claim is adequate  
* supports/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:  
* some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise  
* adequate use of some elaborative techniques  | 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:  
* some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise  
* adequate use of some elaborative techniques  | The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:  
* use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose  |
| 2     | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:  
* claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained  
* alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed  
* claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context  
* supports/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves little depth:  
* evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are weak  
* weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques  | The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for writer’s claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details. The response achieves little depth:  
* evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are weak  
* weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques  | The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:  
* use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose  |
| 1     | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:  
* claim may be confusing or ambiguous  
* supports/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:  
* use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant  | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:  
* use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant  | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:  
* errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure  |