<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Purpose/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The response successfully addresses the task with an effective organizational structure, creating a sense of completeness, coherence, and cohesion. The response is fully developed with a controlling idea throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The response adequately addresses the task with an observable organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though some ideas may be loosely connected. The response is sufficiently developed with a controlling idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The response addresses the task with an inconsistent organizational structure. The response is somewhat developed and may drift from the controlling idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The response attempts to addresses the task with little or no observable organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but provides only a minimal controlling idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The response is undeveloped and/or inappropriate to the task, purpose, and audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Has a claim that is introduced and clearly conveyed; the controlling idea is strongly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task
- Has a claim that is mostly clear; the controlling idea is adequately maintained for the purpose, audience, and task
- Has a claim that may be somewhat unclear; the controlling idea may be insufficiently maintained for the purpose, audience, and task
- Has a claim that may be confusing or vague; the response may be too brief; the controlling idea is minimal and may drift from the purpose, audience, or task
- Has a claim that may be unclear or absent

- Shows skillful use of varied and appropriate transitional words and phrases to link and/or differentiate ideas
- Shows adequate use of varied transitional words and phrases to link and/or differentiate ideas
- Shows limited or simplistic use of transitional words and phrases to link and/or differentiate ideas
- Shows minimal or no use of transitional words and phrases to link and/or differentiate ideas
- May have no observable organizational structure

- Has strong organizational structure, including an effective introduction and conclusion
- Has evident organizational structure, including an adequate introduction and conclusion
- Has inconsistent organizational structure; the introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak
- Has minimal organizational structure; the introduction and/or conclusion may be absent
- May have no observable organizational structure

- Has logical development of ideas from beginning to end with strong, effective connections between and among ideas
- Has adequate development of ideas from beginning to end with appropriate connections between and among ideas
- Has inconsistent development of ideas from beginning to end with unclear connections between and among ideas
- Has limited development of ideas with some unrelated or irrelevant content; ideas may be sequenced arbitrarily
- Uses alternate or opposing claims that are confounding or not acknowledged

- Uses alternate or opposing claims that are effectively acknowledged
- Uses alternate or opposing claims that are adequately acknowledged
- Uses alternate or opposing claims that are minimally acknowledged
- Uses alternate or opposing claims that are confusing or not acknowledged
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Evidence/Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The response addresses the task with thorough support for the claim and includes the effective use of relevant sources, facts, and details. The response effectively elaborates ideas using precise language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The response addresses the task with sufficient support for the claim and includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response sufficiently elaborates ideas using both precise and general language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The response addresses the task with superficial support for the claim and includes the partial use of sources, facts, and details. The response may express ideas using basic or simplistic language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The response attempts to address the task with minimal support for the claim and includes little or no use of sources, facts, and details. The response is unclear or confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The response is undeveloped, lacks elaboration, and provides no support related to the claim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- includes comprehensive, relevant evidence from source material that is skillfully integrated
- demonstrates comprehensive understanding with skillful, logical reasoning using thorough evidence from sources; elaborative support may include (but is not limited to) relevant facts, experiences, descriptions, quotations, specific details, and examples
- uses vocabulary/word choice that is varied, precise, and highly appropriate for the audience and purpose
- uses varied sentence structure throughout the response that demonstrates syntactic fluency and successfully engages the audience
- demonstrates effective and appropriate style and tone that are relevant to the task and purpose
- demonstrates highly integrated, relevant evidence from source material that is skillfully integrated
- demonstrates adequate understanding with some logical reasoning using some evidence from sources; elaborative support may include (but is not limited to) relevant facts, experiences, descriptions, quotations, specific details, and examples
- uses vocabulary/word choice that is appropriate for the audience and purpose
- uses somewhat varied sentence structure that demonstrates adequate syntactic control and generally engages the audience
- demonstrates generally appropriate style and tone
- demonstrates adequate, relevant evidence from source material that is appropriately integrated
- demonstrates basic understanding with weak or uneven reasoning; may consist primarily of source summary; elaborative techniques may include (but are not limited to) facts, experiences, descriptions, quotations, details, and examples
- uses vocabulary/word choice that is simplistic, repetitive, or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose
- uses somewhat varied sentence structure that may partially engage the audience
- demonstrates inconsistent or weak appropriate style and tone
- includes evidence from source material that is minimal or irrelevant, absent, or incorrectly used
- demonstrates minimal understanding with little or no reasoning; attempts at elaborative support may be unclear or confusing
- uses vocabulary/word choice that may be limited, vague, repetitive, or ineffective for the audience and purpose
- uses limited sentence variety that may partially engage the audience
- demonstrates inconsistent or weak appropriate style and tone
- includes evidence from source material, facts, or details to support the claim
- demonstrates little or no understanding and lacks elaboration
- uses minimal or no sentence variety, demonstrating little or no awareness of the audience
- demonstrates little or no evidence of appropriate style and tone
## ACAP SUMMATIVE GRADE 7 ARGUMENTATIVE RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>The response demonstrates an adequate control of conventions.</td>
<td>The response demonstrates a partial control of convention.</td>
<td>The response demonstrates little or no control of conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• demonstrates adequate use of correct sentence formation, grammar, usage, and mechanics</td>
<td>• demonstrates limited use of correct sentence formation, grammar, usage, and mechanics</td>
<td>• demonstrates infrequent use of correct sentence formation, grammar, usage, and mechanics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Holistic Scoring of Conventions
- **Variety**: Scoring considers the range of errors, including errors in sentence formation, grammar, usage, and mechanics.
- **Severity**: Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density**: Scoring considers the proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.

### Nonscorable
A response is nonscorable if it meets any of the following criteria.
- Unintelligible
- In a language other than English
- Off-topic
- Copied text