

Summary of Scoring Approaches for the Individual Written Argument

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is one of the stimulus materials actually used in the argument? (If you remove the part that references the stimulus material does it weaken or change the argument?) 2. Is it related to a theme from the stimulus materials (connecting two)? 	Usually somewhere in the first few paragraphs introducing context.
<p>Zero: Link to stimulus materials spurious or extremely tenuous. No relationship to connecting theme at all.</p> <p>Low: Link to stimulus material is tangential (not spurious but not convincing either). Some theme relating to stimulus materials can be inferred with difficulty.</p> <p>Medium: Stimulus material is discussed but is like an “add on” or jumping off point (could be removed from the response and the argument not be weakened as a result). Can reasonably infer a connection to a theme in the sources.</p> <p>High: Stimulus material is integrated into the argument (e.g., as evidence, counterargument, integral to context). There is a clear relationship to a connecting theme (this can also be seen if there is integration of two stimulus material sources into the argument).</p>	
Row 2: Understand and Analyze Context	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does it make clear why the research question matters? 2. Are specific and relevant details provided? <p>Typically context includes: what the area of inquiry is, who the major voices/stakeholders are in the debate, when it began, where it is an issue, and why it is important/significant.</p>	Usually first few paragraphs.
<p>Zero: If no problem, issue or question is identified (without, there is nothing to put in context).</p> <p>Low: Very broad or vague context/research question (which doesn’t lend itself to evidence-based argument). May make huge assumptions about why the question is important.</p> <p>Medium: General or simplistic, some context provided but it lacks the specifics to make the significance clear.</p> <p>High: Significance of research question is made very clear by providing specific information about the context.</p>	
Row 3: Understand and Analyze Perspective	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the response address the complexity of the problem (through engaging with more than one perspective)? 2. Does it compare perspectives or does it put them in conversation with one another? 	Throughout.
<p>Zero: If no problem, issue or question is identified (without, there is nothing to have a perspective on).</p> <p>Low: Lists or makes reference to more than one perspective (doesn’t compare them), no interaction. Problem is presented simplistically.</p> <p>Medium: Compares perspectives, may oversimplify them or make general comparisons.</p> <p>High: Draws connections between perspectives, puts them in conversation with each other.</p>	

Row 4: Select and Use Evidence	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the evidence clearly relevant and brought together to develop and support the argument? 2. Does it include a range of sources (in terms of variety of perspective or type) and is the quality mainly high? 	Throughout, where evidence is deployed. Bibliography or Works Cited.
<p>Low: No academic or scholarly sources. Information is not used to support an argument.</p> <p>Medium: Evidence used to develop and support argument (but may be inconsistent in its relevance or not well integrated). Sources are varied in type and quality. Evidence may dominate or drive the response.</p> <p>High: Relevant evidence synthesized to develop and support the argument. Sources are from a variety of perspectives and include scholarly sources.</p>	
Row 5: Establish Argument	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the argument logically organized? And well-reasoned? 2. Does the commentary fully explain <i>how</i> the evidence supports claims? 	Overall paragraph structure. Often at the end of paragraphs and / or immediately following a citation as part of the commentary on a source.
<p>Low: Summarizes information, no or very general commentary connecting evidence and claims.</p> <p>Medium: Organized enough to discern the argument. Some explanation that links evidence and claims which may be limited or not consistently provided. May contain some undeveloped assertions (not questioning the evidence enough) or may be dominated by evidence rather than commentary.</p> <p>High: Organization is clear (often signposted or explicit). Often addresses counterarguments. Explains fully how evidence supports claims (hence the argument is clear and convincing).</p>	
Row 6: Establish Argument	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is a conclusion, resolution or solution provided? 2. If so, is enough detail provided to assess the plausibility? 3. Does it fully address the research question? 	Towards the end, usually last paragraph.
<p>Low: No conclusion/resolution or solution provided, or a really contrived solution to a non-existent problem. Or, the conclusion/resolution or solution is completely disconnected from the rest of the response (a U-turn or non-sequitur). Or, the conclusion is a restatement of everything already said without taking a position.</p> <p>Medium: A conclusion/resolution or solution is provided but does not provide detail to assess plausibility. It maybe simplistic or only partially connected to the research question (it veers off course). It may repeat the argument but does take a position.</p> <p>High: A conclusion/resolution or solution is offered that provides sufficient detail to determine plausibility. It fully addresses the research question.</p>	

Row 7: Understand and Analyze Argument	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the response evaluate different perspectives? (Does it make an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses by considering objections, implications or limitations?) 	Throughout.
<p>Zero: No perspectives are presented (only a summary of facts). Low: "Evaluation " is actually opinion, no evidence is given to support evaluative statements. Medium: Simplistic evaluation of different perspectives or only partially supported by evidence. High: Considers objections, implications and limitations of different perspectives.</p>	
Row 8: Apply Conventions (Attribution of Sources)	
What to look for	Where?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check the bibliography for consistency. Check for clarity/accuracy in internal citations. Check to make sure all internal citations match up to the bibliography. 	Bibliography/works cited and internal citations
<p>Zero: No attribution at all. Low: Internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa); unsuccessful linking of internal and bibliography. Medium: Uneven, inconsistent citations; poor or no attributive phrasing, unclear references, including citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url. High: Consistent style, complete bibliographic information (very few, if any, flaws)</p>	
Row 9: Apply Conventions (Quality Writing)	
What to look for	Where?
Check for flaws that impair communication and style/tone appropriate for an academic audience.	Throughout
<p>Low: Many flaws, interference, not appropriate for academic task (colloquial tone). Medium: Some flaws, occasional interference, inconsistent style/tone. High: Effective sentences and word choice, clearly communicates. Style is consistently appropriate for academic task.</p>	