

## Rubric for the Assessment of the Argumentative Essay<sup>1</sup>

	3	2	1	0
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> Background/history Problem definition Thesis statement	Well developed introductory paragraph contains detailed background, a clear explanation or definition of the problem, and a thesis statement.	Introductory paragraph contains some background information and states the problem, but does not explain using details. States the thesis of the essay.	Introduction states the thesis but does not adequately explain the background of the problem. The problem is stated, but lacks detail.	Thesis and/or problem is vague or unclear. Background details are a seemingly random collection of information, unclear, or not related to the topic.
<b>CONCLUSION</b> Summarization Opinions Change suggestions	Conclusion summarizes the main topics without repeating previous sentences; writer's opinions and suggestions for change are logical and well thought out.	Conclusion summarizes main topics. Some suggestions for change are evident.	Conclusion summarizes main topics, but is repetitive. No suggestions for change and/or opinions are included.	Conclusion does not adequately summarize the main points. No suggestions for change or opinions are included.
<b>DEVELOPMENT</b> Synthesis of ideas Refutation Evidences Critical thinking	Content indicates synthesis of ideas, in depth analysis and evidences original thought and support for the topic. Three or more main points are well developed with supporting details. Refutation paragraph(s) acknowledges the opposing view and summarizes their main points. Abundance of evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight. Evidence and examples are vivid and specific, while focus remains tight.	Content indicates original thinking and develops ideas with sufficient and firm evidence. Three or more main points are present but may lack detail and development in one or two. Refutation paragraph(s) acknowledges the opposing view but does not summarize points. Evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight. There are good, relevant supporting examples and evidence.	Content indicates thinking and reasoning applied with original thought on a few ideas. Three or more main points, but all lack development. Refutation paragraph(s) missing and/or vague. Some evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight. There are some examples and evidence, though general.	Shows some thinking and reasoning but most ideas are underdeveloped and unoriginal. Less than three main points, with poor development of ideas. Refutation missing or vague. Little or no evidence of critical, careful thought or analysis and/or insight. There are too few, no examples and evidence, or they are mostly irrelevant.
<b>ORGANIZATION</b> Global structure Flow Effectivity	Logical, compelling progression of ideas in essay; clear structure which enhances and showcases the central idea or theme and moves the reader through the text. Organization flows so smoothly the reader hardly thinks about it. Effective, mature, graceful transitions exist throughout the essay.	Overall, the essay is logically developed. Progression of ideas makes sense and moves the reader easily through the text. Strong transitions exist throughout and add to the essay's coherence.	Progression of ideas in essay is awkward, yet moves the reader through the text without too much confusion. The writer sometimes lunges ahead too quickly or spends too much time on details that do not matter. Transitions appear sporadically, but not equally throughout the essay.	Arrangement of essay is unclear and illogical. The writing lacks a clear sense of direction. Ideas, details or events seem strung together in a loose or random fashion; there is no identifiable internal structure and readers have trouble following the writer's line of thought. Few, forced transitions in the essay or no transitions are present.
<b>WORKS CITED</b> Documentation Integration Formatting	Source material is smoothly integrated into the text. All sources are accurately documented in the desired format both in the text and on the Works Cited section.	Source material is used. All sources are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. Some sources lack credibility.	Source material is used, but integration may be awkward. All sources are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format or lack credibility.	Lacks sources and/or sources are not accurately documented. Format is incorrect for all sources.
<b>MECHANICS</b> Spelling Sentence Structure Punctuation Capitalization Format	The authors make no errors in grammar, mechanics, and/or spelling. Sentence structure is correct. Punctuation and capitalization are correct. Professional format.	The authors make a few errors in grammar, mechanics, and/or spelling, but they do not interfere with understanding. Sentence structure is generally correct. Some awkward sentences do appear. There are one or two errors in punctuation and/or capitalization. Structured format.	The authors make several errors in grammar, mechanics, and/or spelling that interfere with understanding. Work contains structural weaknesses and grammatical errors. There are three or four errors in punctuation and/or capitalization. Rambling format.	The authors make numerous errors in grammar, mechanics, and/or spelling that interfere with understanding. Work contains multiple incorrect sentence structures. There are four or more errors in punctuation and/or capitalization. No format.

<sup>1</sup> Based on <https://pier.macmillan.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Argumentative%20essay%20rubric.pdf>