|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Statement of**  **Purpose/Focus** | **Organization** | **Elaboration of Evidence** | **Language and Vocabulary** | **Conventions** |
| **4** | The response is fully sustained, consistent, and purposely focused:   * opinion is clearly stated, focused, and strongly maintained * opinion is communicated clearly within the context | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:   * effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies * logical progression of ideas from beginning to end * effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose | The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer’s opinion that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details:   * use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, and relevant * effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques | The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:   * use of persuasive vocabulary is clearly appropriate for audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:   * few, if any, errors of usage and sentence formation * effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| **3** | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:   * opinion is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present * context provided for the claim is adequate | The response has a recognizable organizational structure, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:   * adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety * adequate progression of ideas from beginning and end * adequate introduction and conclusion | The response provides adequate support/evidence for the writer’s opinion that includes the use of sources, facts, and details:   * 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 general language:   * use of persuasive vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a adequate command of conventions:   * some errors in usage and sentence formation are present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed * adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Statement of**  **Purpose/Focus** | **Organization** | **Elaboration of Evidence** | **Language and Vocabulary** | **Conventions** |
| **2** | The response is somewhat sustained, with some extraneous materials or a minor drift in focus:   * may be clearly focused on the opinion but is insufficiently sustained * opinion on the issue may be unclear and unfocused | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:   * inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety * uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end * introduction and conclusion, if present, are weak | The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer’s opinion that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details:   * evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven * weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques | The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:   * use of persuasive vocabulary that may at times be inappropriate for audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:   * frequent errors of usage may obscure meaning * inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling |
| **1** | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little or no focus:   * may be very brief * may have a major drift * opinion my be confusing or ambiguous | The response has little or no discernable organizational structure:   * few or no transitional strategies are evident * frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer’s opinion 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 expresses ideas, that are vague, lack clarity, or are confusing:   * use of limited language or persuasive vocabulary * may have little sense of audience and purpose | The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:   * errors are frequent and severe, and meaning is often obscured. |

**Additional Comments:**