

Each student response is scored for three traits: organization/purpose (4 points possible), development/elaboration (4 points possible), and conventions (2 points possible).

Score		
Organization/Purpose	4	<p><b>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:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>effective introduction and conclusion</li> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>
	3	<p><b>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:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</li> </ul>
	2	<p><b>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:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</li> <li>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</li> <li>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</li> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged *</li> </ul>
	1	<p><b>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the topic but may provide little or no focus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</li> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</li> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have and unclear progression</li> <li>alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged *</li> </ul>
	NS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

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

		Score
Evidence /Elaboration	4	<p><b>The response provides thorough elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>
	3	<p><b>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise and more general language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>
	2	<p><b>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes uneven or limited use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>
	1	<p><b>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>
	NS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).

	Score	
<b>Conventions</b>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>
	<b>NS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

Conventions are scored holistically per grade-level standards considering the following guidelines:

- **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