

Score	Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization		Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence		Conventions
	Statement of Purpose/Focus	Organization	Elaboration of Evidence	Language and Vocabulary	
4	<p>The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained alternate or opposing claims are clearly addressed* claim is introduced and communicated clearly within the context 	<p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 strong connections among ideas, with some syntactic variety 	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of evidence from sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete effective use of a variety of elaborative 	<p>The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose 	<p>The response demonstrates a strong command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> few, if any, errors are present in usage and sentence formation effective and consistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling
3	<p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be present context provided for the claim is adequate 	<p>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end adequate introduction and conclusion adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas 	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some evidence from sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise adequate use of some elaborative techniques 	<p>The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose 	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some errors in usage and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling
2	<p>The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be clearly focused on the claim but is insufficiently sustained claim on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused 	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak weak connection among ideas 	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources, facts, and details, and achieves little depth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence from sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques 	<p>The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose 	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> frequent errors in usage may obscure meaning inconsistent use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling
1	<p>The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be very brief may have a major drift claim may be confusing or ambiguous 	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> few or no transitional strategies are evident frequent extraneous ideas may intrude 	<p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant 	<p>The response expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses limited language or domain-specific vocabulary may have little sense of audience and purpose 	<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> errors are frequent and severe and meaning is often obscure
0	A response gets no credit if it provides no evidence of the ability to [fill in with key language from the intended target].				