**Dearborn Public Schools Unit 3 Social Issue Argumentative**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization** | |
| **Statement of Purpose/Focus** | **Organization** |
| **4** | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:   * claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained through TE/IN; context for TE is provided * **alternate claim(s)/counter argument(s) are examined thoroughly and distinguished from main claim with reasoning; strong rebuttal** * reasoning is logical/clear | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:   * effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies * effective introduction with engaging lead and clear, complete CLAIM * body includes all components of an argument in logical order:   -T.S. w/ reason  -evidence/data followed by insight/reasoning w/correct MLA  -counter-claim ( in one body paragraph) w/ reasoning /rebuttal   * conclusion for audience and purpose that supports argument |
| **3** | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:   * claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be used; may not provide context consistently/clearly * **alternate claim(s)/ counter argument is/ are addressed; rebuttal supplied** * reasoning may not be in depth or may lack clarity at times | 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:   * adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety beyond scaffold * body includes most components of an argument ; usually in logical order   -T.S. w/ reason may be unclear  -evidence/data followed & insight/reasoning may be out of order; MLA may be inc.  -counter-claim ( in one body paragraph) w/ reasoning /rebuttal   * adequate introduction and conclusion |
| **2** | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:   * claim(s) on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused * **alternate claim(s)/counter argument may be acknowledged, but not developed with reasoning; rebuttal may be weak or missing** * supporting ideas lack clarity and logical reasoning; not enough reasoning/insight | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:   * inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety or used scaffold as is * body includes some components of an argument although pieces may be missing (TS, quoted TE, MLA, etc.) * conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak |
| **1** | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:   * claim may be confusing ,ambiguous, or is opinion only * **no alternate claim/counter argument addressed; rebuttal missing** * no logical reasoning among supporting ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:   * few or no transitional strategies are evident * body missing key components of an argument * lead/conclusion missing |

**Dearborn Public Schools Unit 3 Social Issue Argumentative Essay**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization** | |
| **Statement of Purpose/Focus** | **Organization** |
| **4** | The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:   * claim is clearly stated, focused and strongly maintained through TE/IN; context for TE is provided * **alternate claim(s)/counter argument(s) are examined thoroughly and distinguished from main claim with reasoning; strong rebuttal** * reasoning is logical/clear | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:   * effective, consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies * effective introduction with engaging lead and clear, complete CLAIM * body includes all components of an argument in logical order:   -T.S. w/ reason  -evidence/data followed by insight/reasoning w/correct MLA  -counter-claim ( in one body paragraph) w/ reasoning /rebuttal   * conclusion for audience and purpose that supports argument |
| **3** | The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:   * claim is clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be used; may not provide context consistently/clearly * **alternate claim(s)/ counter argument is/ are addressed; rebuttal supplied** * reasoning may not be in depth or may lack clarity at times | 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:   * adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety beyond scaffold * body includes most components of an argument ; usually in logical order   -T.S. w/ reason may be unclear  -evidence/data followed & insight/reasoning may be out of order; MLA may be inc.  -counter-claim ( in one body paragraph) w/ reasoning /rebuttal   * adequate introduction and conclusion |
| **2** | The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:   * claim(s) on the issue may be somewhat unclear and unfocused * **alternate claim(s)/counter argument may be acknowledged, but not developed with reasoning; rebuttal may be weak or missing** * supporting ideas lack clarity and logical reasoning; not enough reasoning/insight | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident:   * inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety or used scaffold as is * body includes some components of an argument although pieces may be missing (TS, quoted TE, MLA, etc.) * conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak |
| **1** | The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant detail:   * claim may be confusing ,ambiguous, or is opinion only * **no alternate claim/counter argument addressed; rebuttal missing** * no logical reasoning among supporting ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure:   * few or no transitional strategies are evident * body missing key components of an argument * lead/conclusion missing |