

## Full Write • Claim 2 Argumentative • Target 7 • Grades 6–High School Organization/Purpose

4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	No Score (NS)
The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:	The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:	The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:	The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:	<ul> <li>Insufficient(includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> </ul>	
effective introduction and conclusion	<ul> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</li> </ul>	introduction and/or conclusion may be missing	
<ul> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged *</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged *</li> </ul>	

<sup>\*</sup>Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.



## Full Write • Claim 2 Argumentative • Target 7 • Grades 6–High School Evidence/Elaboration

4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	No Score (NS)
The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language	The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:	The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:	The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:	<ul> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> </ul>	
clear citations or attribution to source material	<ul> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> </ul>	
effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*	adequate use of some elaborative techniques*	<ul> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	generally appropriate style is evident	<ul> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	

This document contains materials that are copyrighted by the Regents of the University of California and/or independent publishers. Do not reproduce for commercial purposes. 05/08/14



## Full Write • Claim 2 Narrative • Informational/Explanatory • Opinion/Argumentative Conventions • Grades 3–11

2 Points	1 Point	0 Points	No Score (NS)
The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:	The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:	The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:	<ul> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<ul><li>In a language other than English</li><li>Off-topic</li><li>Off-purpose</li></ul>

## **Holistic Scoring:**

- Variety: A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- Severity: Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.