Vantage Learning 6-Point Persuasive/Argument Writing Rubric

	Focus and Purpose	Content Development/Elaboration	Organization	Language Use, Voice, and Style	Mechanics and Conventions
	The extent to which the response establishes and maintains an opinion/position/claim, demonstrates a clear understanding of purpose and audience, and completes all parts of the task.	The extent to which the response provides credible support for claims and arguments using valid reasoning and relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] (e.g., facts, data/statistics, quotes, rhetorical questioning, and anecdotes). 1. If applicable with prompt tasks that include sources. 2. Addressing counterarguments begins at grade 6.	The extent to which the response demonstrates a cohesive and unified structure, paragraphing, and transitional strategies to support the logical progression of ideas presented in the argument.	The extent to which the response establishes and consistently maintains a style and tone appropriate to the audience, demonstrates effective control of language, and uses domain-specific word choice and varied sentence structure.	The extent to which the response demonstrates control of mechanics and conventions, including grammar, punctuation, and spelling.
6-Very Effective	Demonstrates a thorough and insightful understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes and maintains a precise claim to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes all parts of the task and may go beyond the limits of the task.	Very effectively develops arguments with logical reasoning and adeptly integrates relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses a variety of elaborative techniques. Convincingly addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Very effectively demonstrates a cohesive and unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains an engaging introduction and an insightful conclusion. Uses effective and skillful paragraphing and transitional strategies throughout.	Demonstrates a very effective style and tone, precise control of language, domain-specific word choice, and an exceptional awareness of audience. Uses well-structured and varied sentences.	Contains few or no errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling.
5-Good	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes and maintains a well-defined claim to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes all parts of the task.	Develops arguments with logical reasoning and successfully integrates relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses consistent elaborative techniques. Clearly addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Demonstrates a mostly unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains a strong introduction and conclusion. Uses consistent paragraphing and transitional strategies.	Demonstrates an effective style and tone, consistent control of language, domain-specific word choice, and a clear awareness of audience. Mostly uses well-structured and varied sentences.	Contains few errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that do not interfere with the communication of the message.
4-Adequate	Demonstrates a general understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Adequately maintains a claim and attempts to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes most parts of the task.	Adequately develops arguments with logical reasoning and integrates some relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses some elaborative techniques. Sufficiently addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Demonstrates a generally unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains an adequate introduction and conclusion. Uses adequate paragraphing and transitional strategies.	Demonstrates an appropriate style and tone, adequate control of language, domain-specific word choice, and a general awareness of audience. Mostly uses correct sentence structure with some sentence variety.	Contains some errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that do not significantly interfere with the communication of the message.
3-Limited	Demonstrates a limited understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes a claim but may be unclear or unfocused in arguing the issue presented in the task. Completes some parts of the task.	Develops limited arguments with inconsistent or irrelevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses weak or ineffective elaborative techniques. Attempts to address opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Demonstrates limited evidence of organizational structure that supports the progression of ideas. Contains an uncertain introduction and/or conclusion. Uses inconsistent paragraphing and transitional strategies with little variety.	May demonstrate an appropriate style and tone, limited control of language, simplistic word choice, and some awareness of audience. May use simple or repetitive sentence structure with insufficient sentence variety.	Contains several noticeable or distracting errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that interfere with the communication of the message.
2-Minimal	Demonstrates a minimal understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes a weak claim and/or demonstrates little attempt to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes few parts of the task.	Develops arguments incompletely with insufficient details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses minimal elaborative techniques. May consider opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Demonstrates minimal evidence of organizational structure. Contains a weak introduction and/or conclusion. Uses ineffective paragraphing and transitional strategies.	Demonstrates an ineffective style and tone, minimal control of language, vague word choice, and a minimal awareness of audience. Makes basic errors in sentence structure and uses little sentence variety.	Contains serious errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that interfere with the communication of the message.
1-Inadequate	Demonstrates a lack of understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Fails to establish a claim, and little or no effort is made to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes few or no parts of the task.	Demonstrates little, if any, development of arguments. Fails to support the writer's claims and provides minimal or no details and/or source-based evidence.[1] Does not address opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]	Demonstrates little or no evidence of organizational structure. Lacks an introduction or conclusion. Uses little or no paragraphing and transitional strategies.	Demonstrates little evidence of style, tone, or control of language. Uses confusing or incoherent word choice and exhibits no awareness of audience. Makes major errors in sentence structure.	Contains errors so severe in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that they significantly interfere with the communication of the message.

Vantage Learning 6-Point Persuasive/Argument Holistic Rubric

Characteristics of Writing — Responses are evaluated based on the following five characteristics of writing: Focus and Purpose; Content Development/Elaboration; Organization; Language Use, Voice, and Style; and Mechanics and Conventions.

6 – The "6" response very effectively communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a thorough and insightful understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes and maintains a precise claim to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes all parts of the task and may go beyond the limits of the task.
- Very effectively develops arguments with logical reasoning and adeptly integrates relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses a variety of elaborative techniques. Convincingly addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Very effectively demonstrates a cohesive and unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains an engaging introduction and an insightful conclusion. Uses effective and skillful paragraphing and transitional strategies throughout.
- Demonstrates a very effective style and tone, precise control of language, domain-specific word choice, and an exceptional awareness of audience. Uses well-structured and varied sentences.
- Contains few or no errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling.

5 – The "5" response clearly communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a clear understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes and maintains a well-defined claim to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes all parts of the task.
- Develops arguments with logical reasoning and successfully integrates relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses consistent elaborative techniques. Clearly addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Demonstrates a mostly unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains a strong introduction and conclusion. Uses consistent paragraphing and transitional strategies.
- Demonstrates an effective style and tone, consistent control of language, domain-specific word choice, and a clear awareness of audience. Mostly uses well-structured and varied sentences.
- Contains few errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that do not interfere with the communication of the message.

4 – The "4" response adequately communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a general understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Adequately maintains a claim and attempts to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes most parts of the task.
- Adequately develops arguments with logical reasoning and integrates some relevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses some elaborative techniques. Sufficiently addresses opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Demonstrates a generally unified structure that supports the logical progression of ideas. Contains an adequate introduction and conclusion. Uses adequate paragraphing and transitional strategies.
- Demonstrates an appropriate style and tone, adequate control of language, domain-specific word choice, and a general awareness of audience. Mostly uses correct sentence structure with some sentence variety.
- Contains some errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that do not significantly interfere with the communication of the message.

3 – The "3" response partially communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a limited understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes a claim but may be unclear or unfocused in arguing the issue presented in the task. Completes some parts of the task.
- Develops limited arguments with inconsistent or irrelevant details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses weak or ineffective elaborative techniques. Attempts to address opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Demonstrates limited evidence of organizational structure that supports the progression of ideas. Contains an uncertain introduction and/or conclusion. Uses inconsistent paragraphing and transitional strategies with little variety.
- May demonstrate an appropriate style and tone, limited control of language, simplistic word choice, and some awareness of audience. May use simple or repetitive sentence structure with insufficient sentence variety.
- Contains several noticeable or distracting errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that interfere with the communication of the message.

2 – The "2" response minimally communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a minimal understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Establishes a weak claim and/or demonstrates little attempt to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes few parts of the task.
- Develops arguments incompletely with insufficient details and/or source-based evidence[1] to support the writer's claims. Uses minimal elaborative techniques. May consider opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Demonstrates minimal evidence of organizational structure. Contains a weak introduction and/or conclusion. Uses ineffective paragraphing and transitional strategies.
- Demonstrates an ineffective style and tone, minimal control of language, vague word choice, and a minimal awareness of audience. Makes basic errors in sentence structure and uses little sentence variety.
- Contains serious errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that interfere with the communication of the message.

1 – The "1" response inadequately communicates the writer's message.

- Demonstrates a lack of understanding of the task, purpose, and audience. Fails to establish a claim, and little or no effort is made to argue the issue presented in the task. Completes few or no parts of the task.
- Demonstrates little, if any, development of arguments. Fails to support the writer's claims and provides minimal or no details and/or source-based evidence.[1] Does not address opposing claims or counterarguments.[2]
- Demonstrates little or no evidence of organizational structure. Lacks an introduction or conclusion. Uses little or no paragraphing and transitional strategies.
- Demonstrates little evidence of style, tone, or control of language. Uses confusing or incoherent word choice and exhibits no awareness of audience. Makes major errors in sentence structure.
- Contains errors so severe in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, and spelling that they significantly interfere with the communication of the message.

1. If applicable with prompt tasks that include sources.
2. Addressing counterarguments begins at grade 6.