NOTE: When using this rubric, the in-between categories (i.e. “E/D”) are meant for work that fall between the other categories either as a matter of degree or as a matter of satisfying only some of the required criteria within that domain.

NOTE: Please consider weighting the various domains based on relative importance. For example, “Cites Sources” might be weighted as only 5% of the total score as opposed to “Argument,” which might merit 15% or 20%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING DOMAIN</th>
<th>NO SCORE</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>PROFICIENT</th>
<th>P/A</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ARGUMENT**         | Element not yet present | ● Has a general argument  
● Explains a little background and context of topic/issue  
● Draws superficial connections or conclusions | ● Makes an argument and develops it in the paper  
● Explains some background and context of topic/issue  
● Draws general or broad connections or conclusions | ● Makes a clear and well developed argument/thesis  
● Explains background and context of topic/issue  
● Makes specific connections and draws meaningful conclusions |     | ● Makes a clear, well developed, and convincing argument/thesis  
● Thoroughly explains background and context of topic/issue  
● Makes insightful connections, draws meaningful conclusions, and raises important implications |
| **MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES** | Element not yet present | ● Mentions questions or alternative interpretations | ● Acknowledges and briefly responds to questions or alternative interpretations when appropriate | ● Acknowledges and responds to questions or alternative interpretations when appropriate |     | ● Acknowledges and responds to questions or alternative interpretations to explore the complexity of the topic when appropriate |
| **EVIDENCE**         | Element not yet present | ● Refers to at least one piece of evidence relevant to the argument | ● Refers to some evidence relevant to argument/thesis | ● Refers to sufficient and detailed evidence from various types of sources, which are relevant to argument/thesis |     | ● Refers to extensive and comprehensive evidence from various types of sources, which are relevant to argument/thesis |
| **ANALYSIS**         | Element not yet present | ● Restates information from multiple sources  
● Presents a few sources in a way that shows consideration of relevance, credibility, or potential bias | ● Summarizes evidence from multiple sources related to the argument  
● Presents some sources in a way that shows consideration of relevance, credibility, or potential bias | ● Elaborates on the significance of evidence from multiple sources in support of the argument  
● Presents most sources in a way that shows consideration of relevance, credibility, or potential bias |     | ● Elaborates on the significance of evidence and synthesizes ideas from multiple sources in support of the argument  
● Consistently presents sources in a way that shows consideration of relevance, credibility, or potential bias |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Domain</th>
<th>No Score</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>E/D</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>D/P</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>P/A</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organization  | Element not yet present | A few ideas are logically sequenced  
A few transitions are used | Some ideas are logically sequenced  
Some transitions connect ideas | Ideas are logically sequenced  
Transitions connect ideas | Ideas are logically sequenced to present a coherent whole  
Transitions guide the reader through the development of the argument |
| Language Use  | Element not yet present | Has *some* control of syntax and vocabulary  
Language and tone are *somewhat* appropriate to the purpose and audience  
Grammar, usage, and mechanics are *somewhat* accurate | Has control of syntax and vocabulary  
Language and tone are *mostly* appropriate to the purpose and audience  
Grammar, usage, and mechanics are *mostly* accurate | Demonstrates varied syntax and effective word choice; uses rhetorical techniques  
Language and tone are appropriate to the purpose and audience  
Grammar, usage, and mechanics are accurate | Has a fluent style with varied syntax, *precise* word choice, and skillful use of rhetorical techniques  
Language and tone are *tailored* to the purpose and audience  
Grammar, usage, and mechanics are free from error |
| Cites Sources | Element not yet present | A few in-text citations and/or elements of the works cited page are accurate | Some in-text citations and elements of the works cited page are accurate | In-text citation and works cited page are *mostly* accurate | In-text citation and works cited page are *accurate* |

Notes on revisions for 2017-18

Modified from 2011 Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity (SCALE) and the Envision Schools  
last updated: September 8, 2017
A desire for more cross-content collaboration, which would then mean “evidence” could expand to include graphs, figures, tables, etc. Also, a suggestion that there be a variety of sources. In response to both of these requests, the evidence category was changed for proficient and advanced to include “from various types of sources.”

Of the suggested revisions, there were a few items that emerged as possible revisions down the road:

- One reviewer suggested that we “research-based” as part of the advanced language for “multiple perspectives.” I think that this would be up for deliberation for a bigger group.
- Do we want to agree as a district on a weighting scale for each domain of the rubric?
- How do we differentiate scoring for SpEd?
- Do we need to reset our anchor papers given that the advanced paper is UC Berkeley “A”?
- Can we link examples of what we mean for some of the key words on the rubric? Build out a glossary of terms? (This relates to our anchor papers).
- CCPA is exploring some new language under “Analysis” that we can revisit next summer
- More clarity on the domain “Cites Work”

There was a point raised that are important to consider in the calibration and scoring process:

- It’s important to point out that the domain “multiple perspectives” is not about presenting and refuting counter-arguments. While that rhetorical move can work, it’s not the only way or even the most effective way “to explore the complexity of the topic.” We are looking for students who can raise a variety of perspectives and figure out elegant and creative ways to make sense of these perspectives.
- How are all judges calibrated? Schools should have scoring and calibration sessions though I’m not sure that is happening.

There was some feedback that we have heard but have decided not to make modifications:

- One participant asked for numbers instead of just “sufficient” or “extensive.” While this certainly would make scoring “easier,” it does have the negative effect of feeling like a checklist both as a scorer and as a writer. The reality of research writing is that it’s hard to say that having 8 pieces of evidence will always make a paper stronger than one with 5 pieces of evidence. The intention in not using numbers is to push the students and adults to develop a shared understanding of what high quality writing looks and sounds like.