

Educational Assessment: Constructed Response Rubric Collection
 Collected and verified by Harry A. Layman during the period May 1, 2015 to March 22, 2016

Probation Review Report -- Appendix A – A Collection of Rubrics

Table of Contents

	Rubric	Dimensions / Score Points	Pages
1	CAE's CLA+ Performance Task	3 / 6: analysis & problem solving; writing effectiveness and writing mechanics; 6x6x6 = 216 possible scores	2 - 4 (3 pages)
2	ETS's GRE AWA – Issue and Argument Tasks	1 / 6: identify & examine, develop ideas, compelling support, fluency & precision, facility with conventions; 6 possible scores	5 - 7 (3 pages)
3	SBAC's Performance Task: Argumentative Grades 6-11	2 / 4: & 1 / 3 purpose and organization, evidence & elaboration, conventions; 4x4x3 = 48 possible scores	8 - 10 (3 pages)
4	CB's SAT Post 2016 Essay Task	3 / 4: reading, analysis & writing; 4x4x4 = 64 possible scores	11 -14 (4 pages)
5	GMAC's GMAT AWA - Analysis of an Argument Task	1 / 6: identify & analyze, develop ideas, effective support, superior control and facility with conventions; 6 possible scores	15 - 16 (2 pages)
6	CB's SAT through 2015 Essay Item	1 / 6: Effective and insightful point of view demonstrating critical thinking with examples, reasons and evidence to support; organization and focus, and progression of ideas; skillful use of language, varied and apt vocabulary; variety of sentence structure; and grammar, usage and mechanics; 6 possible scores	17 -18 (2 pages)
	Rubric Sources and Copyright Information	Table 1: Rubric Sources	19

CLA+ Scoring Rubric	Analysis and Problem Solving Making a logical decision or conclusion (or taking a position) and supporting it by utilizing appropriate information (facts, ideas, computed values, or salient features) from the Document Library	Writing Effectiveness Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence)	Writing Mechanics Demonstrating facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage)
6	<p>States an explicit decision/conclusion/ position</p> <p>Provides comprehensive support, including nearly all of the relevant and credible information, in a manner that demonstrates outstanding analysis and comprehension of the documents</p> <p>Thoroughly refutes contradictory evidence or alternative decisions/conclusions/ positions (if applicable)</p>	<p>Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's arguments</p> <p>Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and clearly cites sources of information</p>	<p>Demonstrates outstanding control of grammatical conventions</p> <p>Consistently writes well-constructed complex sentences with varied structure and length</p> <p>Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied</p>
5	<p>States an explicit decision/conclusion/ position</p> <p>Provides strong support that addresses much of the relevant and credible information, in a manner that demonstrates very good analysis and comprehension of the documents</p> <p>Refutes contradictory information or alternative decisions/conclusions/ positions (if applicable)</p>	<p>Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's arguments</p> <p>Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and cites sources of information</p>	<p>Demonstrates very good control of grammatical conventions</p> <p>Consistently writes well-constructed sentences with varied structure and length</p> <p>Uses varied and sometimes advanced vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas</p>
4	<p>States an explicit decision/conclusion/ position</p> <p>Provides valid support that addresses multiple pieces of relevant and credible information in a manner that demonstrates adequate analysis and comprehension of the documents; some information is omitted</p> <p>May attempt to address contradictory information or alternative decisions/ conclusions/ positions (if applicable)</p>	<p>Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's arguments and logic of those arguments apparent but not obvious</p> <p>Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas several times and cites sources of information</p>	<p>Demonstrates good control of grammatical conventions with few errors</p> <p>Writes well-constructed sentences with some varied structure and length</p> <p>Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety</p>

CLA+ Scoring Rubric	Analysis and Problem Solving Making a logical decision or conclusion (or taking a position) and supporting it by utilizing appropriate information (facts, ideas, computed values, or salient features) from the Document Library	Writing Effectiveness Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence)	Writing Mechanics Demonstrating facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage)
3	<p>States or implies a decision / conclusion / position</p> <p>Provides some valid support, but omits or misrepresents critical information, suggesting only superficial analysis and partial comprehension of the documents</p> <p>May not account for contradictory information (if applicable)</p>	<p>Provides limited or somewhat unclear arguments. Presents relevant information in each response, but that information is not woven into arguments</p> <p>Provides elaboration on facts or ideas a few times, some of which is valid; sources of information are sometimes unclear</p>	<p>Demonstrates fair control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors</p> <p>Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to have similar structure and length</p> <p>Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas adequately but lacks variety</p>
2	<p>States or implies a decision / conclusion / position</p> <p>Provides analysis that addresses a few ideas as support, some of which is inaccurate, illogical, unreliable, or unconnected to the decision/conclusion/ position</p>	<p>Provides limited, invalid, over-stated, or very unclear arguments; may present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points</p> <p>Any elaboration on facts or ideas tends to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's opinion); sources of information are often unclear</p>	<p>Demonstrates poor control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors and some severe errors</p> <p>Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand</p> <p>Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear</p>

CLA+ Scoring Rubric	Analysis and Problem Solving Making a logical decision or conclusion (or taking a position) and supporting it by utilizing appropriate information (facts, ideas, computed values, or salient features) from the Document Library	Writing Effectiveness Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence)	Writing Mechanics Demonstrating facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage)
1	May state or imply a decision / conclusion / position Provides minimal analysis as support (e.g., briefly addresses only one idea from one document) or analysis is entirely inaccurate, illogical, unreliable, or unconnected to the decision / conclusion / position	Does not develop convincing arguments; writing may be disorganized and confusing Does not provide elaboration on facts or ideas	Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical conventions with many errors that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear

	Analyze an Issue Tasks	Analyze an Argument Task
6	<p>Outstanding In addressing the specific task directions, a 6 response presents a cogent, well-articulated analysis of the issue and conveys meaning skillfully. A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> articulates a clear and insightful position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task develops the position fully with compelling reasons and/or persuasive examples sustains a well-focused, well-organized analysis, connecting ideas logically conveys ideas fluently and precisely, using effective vocabulary and sentence variety demonstrates superior facility with the conventions of standard written English (i.e., grammar, usage and mechanics), but may have minor errors 	<p>Outstanding In addressing the specific task directions, a 6 response presents a cogent, well-articulated examination of the argument and conveys meaning skillfully. A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clearly identifies aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task and examines them insightfully develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically and connects them with clear transitions provides compelling and thorough support for its main points conveys ideas fluently and precisely, using effective vocabulary and sentence variety demonstrates superior facility with the conventions of standard written English (i.e., grammar, usage and mechanics), but may have minor errors
5	<p>Strong In addressing the specific task directions, a 5 response presents a generally thoughtful, well-developed analysis of the issue and conveys meaning clearly. A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> presents a clear and well-considered position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task develops the position with logically sound reasons and/or well-chosen examples is focused and generally well organized, connecting ideas appropriately conveys ideas clearly and well, using appropriate vocabulary and sentence variety demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, but may have minor errors 	<p>Strong In addressing the specific task directions, a 5 response presents a generally thoughtful, well-developed examination of the argument and conveys meaning clearly. A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clearly identifies aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task and examines them in a generally perceptive way develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically and connects them with appropriate transitions offers generally thoughtful and thorough support for its main points conveys ideas clearly and well, using appropriate vocabulary and sentence variety demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, but may have minor errors

	Analyze an Issue Tasks	Analyze an Argument Task
4	<p>Adequate</p> <p>In addressing the specific task directions, a 4 response presents a competent analysis of the issue and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity.</p> <p>A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presents a clear position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task • develops the position with relevant reasons and/or examples • is adequately focused and organized • demonstrates sufficient control of language to express ideas with acceptable clarity • generally demonstrates control of the conventions of standard written English, but may have some errors 	<p>In addressing the specific task directions, a 4 response presents a competent examination of the argument and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity.</p> <p>A typical response in this category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies and examines aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task, but may also discuss some extraneous points • develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily, but may not connect them with transitions • supports its main points adequately, but may be uneven in its support • demonstrates sufficient control of language to convey ideas with reasonable clarity • generally demonstrates control of the conventions of standard written English, but may have some errors
3	<p>Limited</p> <p>A 3 response demonstrates some competence in addressing the specific task directions, in analyzing the issue and in conveying meaning, but is obviously flawed.</p> <p>A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is vague or limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue or both • is weak in the use of relevant reasons or examples or relies largely on unsupported claims • is limited in focus and/or organization • has problems in language and sentence structure that result in a lack of clarity • contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that can interfere with meaning 	<p>Limited</p> <p>A 3 response demonstrates some competence in addressing the specific task directions, in examining the argument and in conveying meaning, but is obviously flawed.</p> <p>A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not identify or examine most of the aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task, although some relevant examination of the argument is present • mainly discusses tangential or irrelevant matters, or reasons poorly • is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas • offers support of little relevance and value for its main points • has problems in language and sentence structure that result in a lack of clarity • contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that can interfere with meaning

	Analyze an Issue Tasks	Analyze an Argument Task
2	<p>Seriously Flawed A 2 response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing. A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is unclear or seriously limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue or both • provides few, if any, relevant reasons or examples in support of its claims • is poorly focused and/or poorly organized • has serious problems in language and sentence structure that frequently interfere with meaning • contains serious errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that frequently obscure meaning 	<p>Seriously Flawed A 2 response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing. A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not present an examination based on logical analysis, but may instead present the writer's own views on the subject • does not follow the directions for the assigned task • does not develop ideas, or is poorly organized and illogical • provides little, if any, relevant or reasonable support for its main points • has serious problems in language and sentence structure that frequently interfere with meaning • contains serious errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that frequently obscure meaning
1	<p>Fundamentally Deficient A 1 response demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing. A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides little or no evidence of understanding the issue • provides little or no evidence of the ability to develop an organized response (e.g., is disorganized and/or extremely brief) • has severe problems in language and sentence structure that persistently interfere with meaning • contains pervasive errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that result in incoherence 	<p>Fundamentally Deficient A 1 response demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing. A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides little or no evidence of understanding the argument • provides little evidence of the ability to develop an organized response (e.g., is disorganized and/or extremely brief) • has severe problems in language and sentence structure that persistently interfere with meaning • contains pervasive errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that result in incoherence
0	Off topic (i.e., provides no evidence of an attempt to address the assigned topic), is in a foreign language, merely copies the topic, consists of only keystroke characters or is illegible or nonverbal.	Off topic (i.e., provides no evidence of an attempt to respond to the assigned topic), is in a foreign language, merely copies the topic, consists of only keystroke characters, or is illegible or nonverbal.
NS	The essay response is blank.	The essay response is blank.

**4-Point
Argumentative
Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)**

Score	4	3	2	1	NS
Purpose/Organization	<p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The response is fully sustained and consistently and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas effective introduction and conclusion logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed* 	<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. The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas adequate introduction and conclusion adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed* 	<p>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure, and flaws are evident. The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose, audience, and task inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged * 	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose, audience, or task few or no transitional strategies are evident introduction and/or conclusion may be missing frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintelligible In a language other than English Off-topic Copied text Off-purpose

* acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7

**4-Point
Argumentative
Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)**

Score	4	3	2	1	NS
Evidence/Elaboration	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes the effective use of sources (facts and details). The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive evidence from sources is integrated; references are relevant and specific effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques* vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose effective, appropriate style enhances content 	<p>The response provides adequate support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes the use of sources (facts and details). The response adequately expresses ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate evidence from sources is integrated; some references may be general adequate use of some elaborative techniques vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose generally appropriate style is evident 	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes partial or uneven use of sources: (facts and details). The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some evidence from sources may be weakly integrated, imprecise, or repetitive; references may be vague weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style 	<p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the argument(s) and claim that includes little or no use of sources: (facts and details). The response's expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence from the source material is minimal or irrelevant; references may be absent or incorrectly used minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques; emotional appeal may dominate vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose little or no evidence of appropriate style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintelligible In a language other than English Off-topic Copied text Off-purpose

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).

2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)				
Score	2	1	0	NS
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<p>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintelligible In a language other than English Off-topic Copied text <p>(Off-purpose responses will still receive a score in Conventions.)</p>

Holistic Scoring:

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.

SAT Essay Scoring

Every response written for the redesigned SAT Essay will be read by two scorers. Each scorer will award 1 to 4 points each in reading, analysis, and writing. The scores will be combined for a total of 2 to 8 points in each of the three categories: reading, analysis, and writing.

Point Score	Reading	Analysis	Writing
4	<p>Advanced: The response demonstrates thorough comprehension of the source text. The response shows an understanding of the text’s central idea(s) and of most important details and how they interrelate, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the text. The response is free of errors of fact or interpretation with regard to the text. The response makes skillful use of textual evidence (quotations, paraphrases, or both), demonstrating a complete understanding of the source text.</p>	<p>Advanced: The response offers an insightful analysis of the source text and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the analytical task. The response offers a thorough, well-considered evaluation of the author’s use of evidence, reasoning, and/or stylistic and persuasive elements, and/or feature(s) of the student’s own choosing. The response contains relevant, sufficient, and strategically chosen support for claim(s) or point(s) made. The response focuses consistently on those features of the text that are most relevant to addressing the task.</p>	<p>Advanced: The response is cohesive and demonstrates a highly effective use and command of language. The response includes a precise central claim. The response includes a skillful introduction and conclusion. The response demonstrates a deliberate and highly effective progression of ideas both within paragraphs and throughout the essay. The response has a wide variety in sentence structures. The response demonstrates a consistent use of precise word choice. The response maintains a formal style and objective tone. The response shows a strong command of the conventions of standard written English and is free or virtually free of errors.</p>

Point Score	Reading	Analysis	Writing
3	<p>Proficient: The response demonstrates effective comprehension of the source text. The response shows an understanding of the text’s central idea(s) and important details. The response is free of substantive errors of fact and interpretation with regard to the text. The response makes appropriate use of textual evidence (quotations, paraphrases, or both), demonstrating an understanding of the source text.</p>	<p>Proficient: The response offers an effective analysis of the source text and demonstrates an understanding of the analytical task. The response competently evaluates the author’s use of evidence, reasoning, and/or stylistic and persuasive elements, and/or feature(s) of the student’s own choosing. The response contains relevant and sufficient support for claim(s) or point(s) made. The response focuses primarily on those features of the text that are most relevant to addressing the task.</p>	<p>Proficient: The response is mostly cohesive and demonstrates effective use and control of language. The response includes a central claim or implicit controlling idea. The response includes an effective introduction and conclusion. The response demonstrates a clear progression of ideas both within paragraphs and throughout the essay. The response has variety in sentence structures. The response demonstrates some precise word choice. The response maintains a formal style and objective tone. The response shows a good control of the conventions of standard written English and is free of significant errors that detract from the quality of writing.</p>

Point Score	Reading	Analysis	Writing
2	<p>Partial: The response demonstrates some comprehension of the source text.</p> <p>The response shows an understanding of the text’s central idea(s) but not of important details. The response may contain errors of fact and/or interpretation with regard to the text.</p> <p>The response makes limited and/or haphazard use of textual evidence (quotations, paraphrases, or both), demonstrating some understanding of the source text.</p>	<p>Partial: The response offers limited analysis of the source text and demonstrates only partial understanding of the analytical task. The response identifies and attempts to describe the author’s use of evidence, reasoning, and/or stylistic and persuasive elements, and/or feature(s) of the student’s own choosing, but merely asserts rather than explains their importance, or one or more aspects of the response’s analysis are unwarranted based on the text. The response contains little or no support for claim(s) or point(s) made. The response may lack a clear focus on those features of the text that are most relevant to addressing the task.</p>	<p>Partial: The response demonstrates little or no cohesion and limited skill in the use and control of language. The response may lack a clear central claim or controlling idea or may deviate from the claim or idea over the course of the response. The response may include an ineffective introduction and/or conclusion. The response may demonstrate some progression of ideas within paragraphs but not throughout the response. The response has limited variety in sentence structures; sentence structures may be repetitive. The response demonstrates general or vague word choice; word choice may be repetitive. The response may deviate noticeably from a formal style and objective tone. The response shows a limited control of the conventions of standard written English and contains errors that detract from the quality of writing and may impede understanding.</p>

Point Score	Reading	Analysis	Writing
1	<p>Inadequate: The response demonstrates little or no comprehension of the source text. The response fails to show an understanding of the text’s central idea(s), and may include only details without reference to central idea(s). The response may contain numerous errors of fact and/or interpretation with regard to the text. The response makes little or no use of textual evidence (quotations, paraphrases, or both), demonstrating little or no understanding of the source text.</p>	<p>Inadequate: The response offers little or no analysis or ineffective analysis of the source text and demonstrates little or no understanding of the analytic task. The response identifies without explanation some aspects of the author’s use of evidence, reasoning, and/or stylistic and persuasive elements, and/or feature(s) of the student’s choosing, Or numerous aspects of the response’s analysis are unwarranted based on the text, The response contains little or no support for claim(s) or point(s) made, or support is largely irrelevant. The response may not focus on features of the text that are relevant to addressing the task. Or the response offers no discernible analysis (e.g., is largely or exclusively summary).</p>	<p>Inadequate: The response demonstrates little or no cohesion and inadequate skill in the use and control of language. The response may lack a clear central claim or controlling idea. The response lacks a recognizable introduction and conclusion. The response does not have a discernible progression of ideas. The response lacks variety in sentence structures; sentence structures may be repetitive. The response demonstrates general and vague word choice; word choice may be poor or inaccurate. The response may lack a formal style and objective tone. The response shows a weak control of the conventions of standard written English and may contain numerous errors that undermine the quality of writing.</p>

See <http://gmac.com/awascoringguides> 150816

<http://www.gmac.com/~media/Images/gmac/GMAT/archive/analysisofanargument.pdf>

Analytical Writing Assessment – GMAC – Rubric for Analyze an Argument

From GMAC web site – “analysisofanargument.pdf” – as of 150816. Harry A Layman

Pts	Overall Response Rating	Characteristics of Response
6	Outstanding—a cogent, well-articulated critique of the argument, demonstrating mastery of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clearly identifies and insightfully analyzes important features of the argument• Develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them smoothly with clear transitions• Effectively supports the main points of the critique• Demonstrates superior control of language, including diction and syntactic variety and the conventions of standard written English. There may be minor flaws
5	Strong—a well-developed critique of the argument, demonstrating good control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clearly identifies important features of the argument and analyzes them in a generally thoughtful way• Develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions• Sensibly supports the main points of the critique• Demonstrates clear control of language, including diction and syntactic variety• Demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, but may have minor flaws
4	Adequate—a competent critique of the argument, demonstrating adequate control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identifies and capably analyzes important features of the argument• Develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily, but may not always connect them with transitions• Supports the main points of the critique• Demonstrates adequate control of language, including diction and syntactic variety, but may lack syntactic variety• Displays control of the conventions of standard written English, but may have some flaws

Pts	Overall Response Rating	Characteristics of Response
3	Limited—a competent but clearly flawed critique of the argument, demonstrating some control of the elements of effective writing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not identify or analyze most of the important features of the argument, although some analysis is present • Is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas • Offers support of little relevance and value for points of the critique • Uses language imprecisely and/or lacks sentence variety • Contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics
2	Seriously flawed—a paper demonstrating serious weakness in analytical writing skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to show an understanding of and does not identify or analyze the main features of the argument • Does not develop ideas or is disorganized • Provides few, if any, relevant or reasonable supports • Has serious, frequent problems in the use of language and sentence structure • Contains numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics that interfere with meaning
1	Fundamentally Deficient—a paper demonstrating fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze the argument or to develop an organized response to it • Has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure • Contains a pervasive pattern of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, thus resulting in incoherence
	Unscorable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A paper that is totally illegible or obviously not written on the assigned topic

Essay Scoring Guide -- pre-2016 SAT Essay scoring rubric

Scoring Guide

Score of 6

An essay in this category demonstrates clear and consistent mastery, although it may have a few minor errors. A typical essay:

- Effectively and insightfully develops a point of view on the issue and demonstrates outstanding critical thinking, using clearly appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence to support its position
- Is well organized and clearly focused, demonstrating clear coherence and smooth progression of ideas
- Exhibits skillful use of language, using a varied, accurate and apt vocabulary
- Demonstrates meaningful variety in sentence structure
- Is free of most errors in grammar, usage and mechanics

Score of 5

An essay in this category demonstrates reasonably consistent mastery, although it has occasional errors or lapses in quality. A typical essay:

- Effectively develops a point of view on the issue and demonstrates strong critical thinking, generally using appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence to support its position
- Is well organized and focused, demonstrating coherence and progression of ideas
- Exhibits facility in the use of language, using appropriate vocabulary
- Demonstrates variety in sentence structure
- Is generally free of most errors in grammar, usage and mechanics

Score of 4

An essay in this category demonstrates adequate mastery, although it has lapses in quality. A typical essay:

- Develops a point of view on the issue and demonstrates competent critical thinking, using adequate examples, reasons and other evidence to support its position
- Is generally organized and focused, demonstrating some coherence and progression of ideas
- Exhibits adequate but inconsistent facility in the use of language, using generally appropriate vocabulary
- Demonstrates some variety in sentence structure
- Has some errors in grammar, usage and mechanics

Score of 3

An essay in this category demonstrates developing mastery, and is marked by ONE OR MORE of the following weaknesses:

- Develops a point of view on the issue, demonstrating some critical thinking, but may do so inconsistently or use inadequate examples, reasons or other evidence to support its position
- Is limited in its organization or focus, or may demonstrate some lapses in coherence or progression of ideas
- Displays developing facility in the use of language, but sometimes uses weak vocabulary or inappropriate word choice
- Lacks variety or demonstrates problems in sentence structure
- Contains an accumulation of errors in grammar, usage and mechanics

Score of 2

An essay in this category demonstrates little mastery, and is flawed by ONE OR MORE of the following weaknesses:

- Develops a point of view on the issue that is vague or seriously limited, and demonstrates weak critical thinking, providing inappropriate or insufficient examples, reasons or other evidence to support its position
- Is poorly organized and/or focused, or demonstrates serious problems with coherence or progression of ideas
- Displays very little facility in the use of language, using very limited vocabulary or incorrect word choice
- Demonstrates frequent problems in sentence structure
- Contains errors in grammar, usage and mechanics so serious that meaning is somewhat obscured

Score of 1

An essay in this category demonstrates very little or no mastery, and is severely flawed by ONE OR MORE of the following weaknesses:

- Develops no viable point of view on the issue, or provides little or no evidence to support its position
- Is disorganized or unfocused, resulting in a disjointed or incoherent essay
- Displays fundamental errors in vocabulary
- Demonstrates severe flaws in sentence structure
- Contains pervasive errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that persistently interfere with meaning

Score of 0

Essays not written on the essay assignment will receive a score of zero

Educational Assessment: Constructed Response Rubric Collection
 Collected and verified by Harry A. Layman during the period May 1, 2016 to March 22, 2016

Table 1: Rubric Sources

	Rubric	Source
1	CAE's CLA+ Perf Task	Retrieved from: http://cae.org/images/uploads/pdf/CLA_Plus_Scoring_Rubric.pdf verified March 22, 2016.
2	ETS's GRE AWA: Issue and Argument Tasks	For issue and argument (resp.) tasks, retrieved from URL below (verified March 22, 2016) https://www.ets.org/gre/revised_general/prepare/analytical_writing/issue/scoring_guide and https://www.ets.org/gre/revised_general/prepare/analytical_writing/argument/scoring_guide
3	SBAC's Performance Task: Argumentative, Grades 6-11	Retrieved from and verified March 22, 2016. http://sbac.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/PerformanceTaskWritingRubric_Argumentative.pdf Previously available from http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/subjects/science/assessment/smarter-balanced_scoring_rubrics.pdf , http://www.livebinders.com/play/play?id=774846 and https://www.smarterbalanced.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Smarter-Balanced-Scoring-Guide-for-ELA-Full-Writes.pdf
4	CB's SAT Post 2016 Essay Task	Retrieved from and verified March 22, 2016: https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/scores/understanding-scores/essay
5	GMAC's GMAT AWA – Analysis of an Argument Task	Verified 3/22/2016 with information at http://www.gmac.com/gmat/understand-gmat-exam-scores/how-to-use-the-analytical-writing-assessment-score.aspx and downloaded previously from http://www.gmac.com/~media/Images/gmac/GMAT/archive/analysisofanargument.pdf
6	CB's SAT Essay Item, 2005 - 2015	Retrieved from and verified March 22, 2016: https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat-essay-scoring-before-march-2016

All rubrics are elements of works by their respective publishers. 1: ©2016 Council for Aid to Education; 2: © 2016 by Educational Testing Service; 3: ©2016 Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium; 4: © 2016 The College Board; 5: ©2002-2016, Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®); 6: © 2016 The College Board.