

Rubrics for Assessment of ERWC Students as Readers, Writers, Speakers, and Learners

Developed by Norm Unrau, Roberta Ching, Meline Aksashian, Debra Robinson, and Shirley Hargis

Rubrics support students who are—or who are becoming—expert learners. When rubrics are used interactively with students throughout a learning sequence, they can play a foundational role in helping students exercise the practices and habits of mind that will carry them into the future as goal-oriented learners who crave, rather than dread, constructive feedback.

This document will introduce different types of rubrics found within various ERWC modules, and it will reference exemplars that teachers can use or adapt for other assignments. It will discuss approaches to creating or modifying rubrics, and it will offer recommendations for how to use them. An underlying assumption is that rubrics created with and for students as instruments for feedback are likely to promote greater student engagement and growth.

Rubric Types and the ERWC

Holistic vs. Analytic Rubrics

Secondary English teachers are intimately familiar with rubrics used as scoring guides to evaluate students' products or performances. Such rubrics typically list and define the traits that will be judged, provide a rating scale, and outline the features or qualities (i.e., descriptors) that constitute the rating for each trait. Two categories of rubric are commonly used in English classrooms: holistic and analytic. Holistic rubrics identify components in a text, but scorers then synthesize all dimensions of a student's work into one score, either a letter grade or a number. Analytic rubrics, on the other hand, identify multiple components or traits in the text for evaluation, and they are scored separately. When these rubrics are applied by a teacher or peer, a student's work might be rated at the top of the scale for some components but lower for others. That feedback on components of an essay enables the writer to observe and respond to a particular trait of writing that, according to the evaluator, needs development to improve performance. That feedback is one important benefit of examining students' products through the lens of a rubric. With more specific information about what is valued in a text, both teacher and student obtain a clearer picture of the elements of a composition that ought to be given further attention. Then students, with teacher support, can identify, articulate, and pursue learning goals for the improvement of their work.

Rubrics for Assessing Summative Writing

In previous versions of the ERWC's twelfth-grade course, nearly every culminating assignment was evaluated using the rubric from the California State University's English Placement Test (EPT), which, at the time, determined students' leveled placement in required composition courses. The EPT rubric (see Appendix A) was created by CSU faculty and designed to score academic essays. It consisted of six criteria and six ratings for each criterion. The six criteria for evaluation included the following: (1) Response to the topic, (2) Understanding and use of the assigned reading, (3) Quality and clarity of

Appendix A. CSU's English Placement Test (Retired)

The EPT Criteria is no longer used for statewide placement testing. The CSU currently uses multiple measures including SBAC levels, ACT or SAT scores, high school coursework and GPA for placement, and many CSUs have adopted the practice of Directed Self-Placement for incoming first year students. Students are guided through a self-assessment process in order to select between a one-semester or two-semester version of first-year composition and are often offered additional support such as tutoring as needed.

thought, (4) Organization, development, and support, (5) Syntax and command of language, and (6) Grammar, usage, and mechanics. The EPT task asked students to read a paragraph and create an insightful response that demonstrated “a thorough critical understanding of the passage.” Given the focus on text-based argument in ERWC 1.0, the EPT rubric was a natural choice to become the common rubric for the course. As part of ERWC 2.0, the EPT rubric was adapted with more user-friendly language for use by teachers *and students*. While ERWC 3.0’s structural changes have made it unlikely that any single rubric will serve for all the culminating tasks in a school year, the EPT rubric remains a go-to rubric that can be used or adapted for many reading-based argument assignments. For example, an app review rubric in “The Daily Me” module was adapted from the EPT rubric by adding a trait related to genre awareness (see Appendix B); that rubric was itself slightly adapted for the “Daily Challenge” module in order to score a Public Service Announcement proposal.

Appendix B.
Rubric for App Review from “The Daily Me” Module. *This rubric was adapted from the EPT rubric by including a genre awareness trait.*

With the introduction of an eleventh-grade course in ERWC 3.0, it seemed natural to employ SBAC rubrics as resources since ERWC teachers in California, Washington, and Hawaii were already familiar with them. The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) was established in 2010 to create Common Core State Standards-aligned tests used by many states. SBAC-created rubrics are used to assess writing tasks on the test. Reflecting the Common Core State Standards identification of three general rhetorical purposes for writing, SBAC writing rubrics for high school students through grade eleven include (1) narrative, (2) informative-explanatory, and (3) argumentative compositions as well as a rubric for Brief Writes. The SBAC argumentative performance task requires students to read multiple texts written in different genres and then draw on them for evidence in a coherent argument with a counterargument. The SBAC Argumentative Performance Task rubric explicitly focuses on argumentation (see Appendix B). The rubric has eleven criteria subdivided into three categories: Organization and Purpose, Evidence and Elaboration, and Conventions. Scorers give 3 separate scores, one for each category. Teachers are encouraged to adapt SBAC rubrics for their students and for their own purposes, such as the rubric for the culminating task in the ERWC module “The Distance Between Us.”

SBAC Argumentative Performance Task Rubric is available on the SBAC online portal:
portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/performance-task-writing-rubric-argumentative.pdf.

The English Language Proficiency Assessment for California (ELPAC) assesses the English Language Proficiency of English Learners and employs rubrics for both written *and* spoken English. The rubric for the “Express an Opinion” task has four criteria which closely resemble those of the English Placement Test. Students must state a position or opinion, provide support, and for grades 6-12, provide two or more reasons. Coherence, grammar and word choice, spelling and punctuation, and register are all assessed, and students must write 6 or more sentences. These rubrics are available on the ELPAC Web site.

Rubrics for Assessing Rhetorical Decision Making

Rubrics can provide valuable information about rhetorical decision making. They can embody both aspects of a work’s rhetorical situation and genre conventions. The third edition of ERWC addresses genre awareness and genre analysis as aspects of transfer of learning, and it strives to prepare students to communicate effectively and think critically across diverse contexts. To support the development of these competencies, teachers are urged to help students make their own choices about forms of communication and their purposes. To offer students opportunities to practice rhetorical decision making, such as choices they make about genre, the Assignment Template was revised to include a section on “Making Choices as You Write.” With added attention to genre as a key concept for transfer, more genre-specific rubrics appear in the third edition.

With augmented attention to genre, many ERWC modules afford students the opportunity to select a genre for the culminating task that is appropriate to the rhetorical situation. Because of that, rubrics that assess rhetorical decision making can serve as helpful instructional tools. Many ERWC teachers find it challenging to assess student work on culminating tasks when it takes different forms. A multi-genre rubric enables teachers to meet those challenges. An activity in the module “Waste More, Want More” (see Appendix C) serves as a model of a multi-genre rubric that assesses rhetorical decision making.

Appendix C.

This is Activity 19: Considering Your Task and Your Rhetorical Situation – Rubric. This rubric helps teachers address the assessment of culminating tasks that offer students alternative genre choices.

Rubrics for Shorter Writing Tasks

Rubrics can also be created to assess and provide feedback on shorter writing tasks that provide practice in summarizing, analyzing, and synthesizing texts. One such writing assignment is the rhetorical précis, a four-sentence analytical summary. This high leverage assignment is demanding for students but quick to review for teachers. Teachers can assign them to formatively assess students’ reading comprehension while students can use them as the basis for upcoming text-based writing and speaking assignments. The module “Daily Challenge” supports students along the way to writing a précis by guiding them through activities like writing single sentence summaries with rhetorically active verbs, analyzing rhetorical situation, using parallel construction, examining a mentor précis, and using a self-checklist to guide revision. “Daily Challenge” provides not only a rubric for the rhetorical précis, but also an annotated bibliography rubric which evaluates a précis that has been modified for its new purpose.

Appendix D.

This protocol from the “High Impact Strategies Toolkit to Support English Learners in ERWC Classrooms” focuses on helping students gather feedback for improvement in the writing of a rhetorical précis.

Appendix E.

This rubric guides students as they peer review a summary and reflective response in the 11th grade ERWC module “Changing Minds: Thinking About Immigration.” This activity was adopted by one high school to use across the curriculum. It enabled the whole school to share a common approach to developing students’ summary writing skills and assessing their reading comprehension.

Appendix F.

This rubric can be used to rate a short writing assignment or Brief Write, such as a paragraph or a quickwrite.

SBAC is another resource for rubrics that can be used with short writing assignments. In addition to the longer performance tasks, the SBAC assigns Brief Writes, which require students to compose a well-developed paragraph. They are scored using a rubric that rates the Brief Write on a 3-point scale of 2 to 0 (see Appendix F). This rubric can be adapted to use with the quickwrite prompts that appear in many modules and to focus on different instructional targets. In the example, the target is organization, but a different target might be elaboration of evidence or effectiveness of examples. Of course, not all shorter writing should be assessed. Giving students frequent low-stakes opportunities to articulate ideas in writing will help them develop writing stamina.

Rubrics to Assess Spoken Language

Providing feedback, formal and informal, on the use of spoken language is important for all students. Using rubrics to guide the development of students' spoken academic language ranging from collaborative work and Socratic discussions to podcasts and formal speeches is a valuable part of a teacher's toolkit. A rubric to assess student discussion based on the CCSS for Speaking/Listening standards can be used as a low-stakes way to help students develop this critical skill (Appendix G) while rubrics for assessing formal speeches can be used for summative assessment (Appendix H and I.)

Appendix G.

This is a simple rubric on a three-point scale (emergent, developing, advanced) that can be used or adapted for many group discussion situations.

Appendix H.

This is an activity from the "Ready to Launch" module in which students help develop the rubric for a graduation speech.

Appendix I.

This is a speech rubric from the "Remembering Injustice" module that can be used or adapted for formal speech assignments.

Using Rubrics for Instruction

Rubrics—Thinking Local

Rubrics like the retired EPT Criteria and those from the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium were generated by teams of professionals to be used with standardized summative assessments across the state and nation. Organizations like ETS and SBAC expend significant resources to assure that students' work is scored as objectively as possible, and this process includes developing benchmark papers and using them to calibrate readers before they score papers. In some ways, classroom teachers can take a page from these test creators, but in other ways, it's better to turn the page.

There are many good reasons to use benchmark papers at the local level. Many secondary teachers are lucky enough to be part of a grade-level team or some form of professional learning community. Whether a teacher is part of a team or the sole torch-bearer for ERWC or some other course, saving and annotating student exemplars is a professional practice that pays ongoing dividends. To maximize the effectiveness of rubrics, they should be accompanied by sample benchmark papers or recorded speeches that illustrate the score points, ideally with explanations for why the paper or speech received the score it did. Asking students to apply a rubric to student samples, either from the current class or previous classes, is also an important part of developing students' understanding of what constitutes proficient academic writing and speaking. If teachers do have colleagues who assign common tasks (on the same campus or within the school district), collaboratively scoring papers is a valuable form of professional learning. Colleagues can calibrate their grading and get a clearer view of the level of proficiency that students achieved across ERWC classes in a school or a school district. What they learn can inform their personal teaching goals and contribute to the development of plans to support instruction.

With planning and supporting instruction in mind, using rubrics only for summative assessment amounts to a series of missed opportunities. When used as tools for formative assessment, rubrics have proven to make a positive contribution to students' growth (Panadero & Jonsson 140). After all, as developing expert learners, students depend on ongoing feedback to set personal learning goals and measure their own progress. And as people, writers hunger for responses because they want to know if they have been heard. Rubrics can help to offer *timely* formative feedback to both students and their teachers. With rubrics, the speed of turnaround can be significantly increased since the rubric allows for general feedback, and teachers only need to provide a limited number of paper-specific comments. Furthermore, when used as a tool to enhance peer-feedback in the classroom, rubrics can provide students with immediate feedback to form learning goals while they are in the midst of a writing task. Notably, the

sooner students get feedback on the tasks they've completed, the more signs of improvement appear in subsequent tasks.

Rubrics created with the local context in mind make important contributions to instruction. Teachers routinely create rubrics and adapt existing ones. Ideally, such rubrics are generated in relation to the purpose they will serve, the learning they target, the learning sequence they fit within, and the students who will use them. Wherever a rubric falls on the spectrum between “task-specific” and “generic,” teacher and students must understand the rubric and how it will measure success. Beyond that, students should understand the connection between rubric and transferrable skills, habits of mind, and/or threshold concepts that the task asks students to employ. If students achieve high marks on an assignment but have difficulty expressing how that success demonstrates personal progress in relationship to previous assignments, it may be that the student approached the task divorced from an important bigger picture. As teachers frame lessons with transfer in mind, rubrics should be part of those conversations to generate greater developmental clarity.

Rubrics are not just for evaluation—they are also for self-assessment. They are not just for clarifying targets; they are also for setting goals. While providing valuable feedback, they create opportunities for multiple student benefits. Upcoming sections will dive more deeply into these claims.

Appendix J.

This is a rubric designed by Debra Robinson as part of her assessment of ERWC students' prior-knowledge at the beginning of the 12th grade course. It reflects the prerequisite ERWC standards identified in ERWC 2.0 and is instrumental in determining and setting course goals. It is particularly adaptable for ERWC courses taking a standards-based approach to instruction. In this way, rubrics are tailored for assignments, yet provide some consistency for students' reflections, self-assessment, and progress-monitoring.

From Deficits to Aspirations: Reframing Rubrics

The EPT and SBAC rubrics were designed primarily for summative assessments. They provide scores to place students in appropriate post-secondary instructional environments or to offer students, schools, districts, and states information about their students' performance in writing. By design, they assess strengths and weaknesses in student performance. However, these rubrics can also serve as resources for the design of formative assessments that give individual students and their teachers information about specific learning goals to which students can aspire. That shift can have far reaching effects on the way students perceive and apply rubrics. When aspirational rubrics are directed toward future development, not at issuing a grade or score, they become explicit instruments for students' effort, assets, and growth.

Whereas rubrics for summative assessment are applied at the end of the writing process, aspirational rubrics are used primarily during the drafting and editing stages—before students' essays become structured or crystalized products for “publication” and grading. When teachers provide feedback to their students at early drafting stages using an aspirational rubric, students can transform that feedback into goals for the subsequent evolution of their written work, and the teacher's input becomes more valued. How many of us have spent evenings and weekends writing final comments on students' papers in hopes that our words of advice might transfer to the next writing task only to see students race to read the grade and skip the suggestions for improvement? By providing feedback at the drafting stage rather than at an end-state, a teacher's recommendations are likely to communicate more directly and supportively, as a coach rather than a judge. And those suggestions for improvement are more likely to become integrated into student planning for the essay's next stages of revision, especially if students immediately provide a written response or a brief plan for how they will use the feedback.

How do we transform summative assessment rubrics into aspirational rubrics? ERWC teachers have provided us with some excellent examples or ideas about how these transformations can occur. (See the ERWC Online Community for Jeff Frieden’s Webinar entitled “Guiding Students into Making Real-World Writing Decisions Using ‘The Daily Me’/Part 2.) If we take the descriptors for the highest score of a writing rubric as a statement of our aspirational learning goals, those goals become the targets at which students direct their revising process. Some ERWC teachers have used the EPT’s Superior or 6 level descriptors as targets or learning goals that students use to direct and motivate their writing process. The SBAC’s elements based on the California Common Core State Standards can similarly be transformed into an aspirational set of targets. A suggested format for an aspirational rubric based on SBAC criteria for argumentative writing tasks is presented in Appendix K.

Success criteria are also aspirational, establishing what makes a particular kind of text effective. Success criteria are measurable outcomes of a project. The term comes from the world of business but has been adopted by educators. An example of a success criterion for an open letter might be, “develops analysis by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, details, quotations, or other information or examples including personal information.” Instead of rating the open letter on a scale of 1 to 6, students and their teachers determine if the writer has met this target. It makes clear to students what they should aspire to, and after creating a draft, they can engage in the metacognitive process of self-assessing the extent to which they have met it. Based on this self-assessment they can also create personal learning goals for the current and future assignments.

Building a Class Rubric or Creating Success Criteria

When we involve students in the construction of a rubric and integrate that process with classroom instruction, several benefits arise (Stevens & Levi 49-64). Misunderstandings and misinterpretations about how student work will be evaluated are reduced significantly. Criteria for assessment become transparent because students are present at the rubric’s creation. The elements of a writing task and expectations for performance that might not be apparent to students when they read a prompt for a speaking or writing task become clear because students generate the criteria for the rubric. More students become involved in unpacking elements of a task that translate into the task’s scoring guide. At the same time, students become more aware that they are agents in their own education as they take an active role in constructing the tools that will measure their progress as learners. The process can also inform students’ identification of learning goals. Lastly, the rubric creation process becomes a shared endeavor of the classroom community and can contribute to that community’s development rather than being solely the domain of the teacher.

Some ERWC modules, such as “Juvenile Justice,” already have a success criteria-creating activity built in (Appendix L). Students analyze an open letter that serves as a mentor text and infer success criteria from the letter for the eventual evaluation of their own letters. For other protocols for creating and using success criteria, see the High Impact Strategies Toolkit: Unpacking the Prompt and Success Criteria for Argumentative Writing and Analyzing Mentor Texts and Crafting Success Criteria.

Appendix K.

This is an example of how rubric criteria can be reframed as aspirational learning goals. A left-hand column provides specifications directly from the SBAC rubric but those elements have become “Aspirational Learning Goals” rather than a list of attributes to be graded. A column on the right provides space for a teacher, or a peer editor, to comment on each element. These commentaries can be either commendations, recommendations, or a combination of both. Their purpose is to guide the development of the student’s paper after reviewing an early draft or during the editing process.

Appendix L.

This rubric arose from students analyzing an open letter as a mentor text in “Juvenile Justice” and then creating success criteria for evaluating their own letters.

Appendix M.

This appendix shows how success criteria, in this case from Juvenile Justice, can be used to develop a full rubric.

To turn success criteria into a rubric, students, with teacher guidance, can describe what qualities a text such as an open letter would need to demonstrate. Limiting the scores to three, such as Superior, Adequate, and Needs Improvement, will simplify the task. For the superior rating, the class can rely on the mentor text to determine the descriptions of each criterion. A letter about a central issue that a reader rated as Superior would, for example, communicate the writer’s strong feelings about the issue. The next steps entail finding language that best describes a letter at an “Adequate” and “Needs Improvement” level. An “Adequate” rating might apply to a letter in which an issue is simply identified without communicating the writer’s strong feelings. A rating of “Needs Improvement” might apply to a student’s letter in which the issue itself is not clearly defined or described. Once students and their teacher have generated language to capture levels of quality for each criterion, the rubric can be used by students to inform their development of the letter, by peers to offer feedback for revision, and by the teacher for final evaluation of the work. The process of creating a full rubric can be facilitated with a table projected onto a screen. Criteria can be listed down the left column, and ratings described in the rows across from each criterion. Appendix M suggests how that procedure works with the rubric for the Juvenile Justice letter.

Modules that engage students in genre analysis to prepare for the culminating task are natural spaces for students to consider success criteria and/or develop rubrics (e.g., an app review in “Daily Me,” a poster session in “Hawkeye: Working Class Hero,” a graduation speech in “Ready to Launch”). In “Ready to Launch,” the purpose of Activity 14 is “To establish clear expectations around genre conventions and organizational structures.” Richard Heilemann, the developer of that module, explains that, as students refer to their personal learning goals created earlier in the module, they will develop a rubric to evaluate the graduation speeches that they produce as their culminating task. The rubric helps students outline their speeches and is then used to score them as they are delivered. That rubric assesses specific traits, including (1) clarity of theme; (2) appropriateness of tone; (3) mindful incorporation and consideration of genre conventions appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion; (4) effective structure; and (5) delivery. Students collaborate in small groups to determine criteria for a four-point rubric for each element. A four-point rubric for “effective structure” guides them as they build the entire rubric together.

Element	Score 1: Does not meet standard	Score 2: Approaching standard	Score 3: Meets standard	Score 4: Exceeds standard
Structure	Speech has no sense of structure or organization	Speech attempts a sense of structure or organization, but the audience may feel lost during the delivery	Speech has a clear and defined sense of beginning, middle, and end	Speech purposefully guides the audience and returns to the main theme to give the speech a sense of coming full circle

Once all groups have developed a draft rubric, they meet as a class to put together a common class rubric that will be used to evaluate every student’s graduation speech.

Keep in mind that a class rubric is a work in progress. Features in the rubric may need further refinement following its use in the classroom.

Linking Learning Goals and Rubrics

Rubrics provide actionable feedback. Glowing but vague commendations in the margins of students’ papers may not give students a sufficiently clear idea of what it was in their writing that evoked a reader’s appreciation. However, if a rubric contains that information, then students can more easily determine the qualities in their work that garnered praise and continue to develop those qualities. If students have

analyzed one or more mentor texts and participated in the design of the rubric and the descriptors, the students will understand more clearly how they earned the commendation. Repeated feedback that specifies problems, such as paragraph development, provides students with clear messages about aspects of their writing that can evolve into important learning goals for students’ development as writers.

Giving repeated feedback with rubrics identifies trends in students’ work for the teacher and writer—and the program, if scoring is done collaboratively across classes. The ERWC provides a mechanism, in the form of the “Where I Am and Where I Am Going” chart, for students to track trends in the work they are producing.

Module Title and Writing Assignment (for example, essay, summary, quickwrite, etc.)	Rubric Score and/or Teacher Comments	Strengths (using language from the rubric, teacher’s comments, peer-response comments, or your own perceptions)	Areas to Improve (using language from the rubric, teacher’s comments, peer-response comments, or your own perceptions)	Where I’m Going: Goals for My Next Writing Assignment (using language from the rubric)

This chart is part of students’ ongoing portfolio maintenance. Rubrics can guide students as they draft personal learning goals for their development as readers, writers, speakers, and learners, but this developmental work can be especially effective when students monitor their own progress over time. When students use feedback and data to set performance targets and then monitor their own progress, they are doing what expert learners do. By critically thinking about their own work (both individual assignments and their development over time as reflected in their portfolios), students learn to analyze their own texts, make claims about the qualities of those texts, and identify evidence that supports those claims and explicates those qualities. They learn to identify the rhetorical features that contribute to the persuasiveness of their own texts. As they become critical readers of their own writing, using the shared lexicon of the rubric, they can become more effective at revision and can transfer what they learn to later writing opportunities.

Not the least of these considerations, rubrics enable improved connections and communication between students and between a student and the teacher. Although we may not always be aware of the multiple messages that rubrics convey to those who use them, rubrics facilitate the communication of the learning goals—sometimes not obvious to students—that drive and support a teacher’s instruction. As we have seen, rubrics send a multitude of messages about writing and its qualities, what traits arise in writing that is strong and persuasive and what traits students will want to endeavor to strengthen.

Conclusion

The rubrics referenced throughout this document illustrate the multiple purposes that rubrics serve and the multiple ways that everyone from large-scale test designers to classroom teachers have adapted rubrics for various educational purposes. The mark of a good rubric is how clearly it articulates the traits to be evaluated in writing or speaking and the ease with which it can be used by scorers, whether they are professionals or students. All of the sample rubrics discussed here have been carefully constructed to meet these requirements. Hopefully, when ERWC teachers are in search of a rubric, they find one here that will serve as-is or with modifications.

But finding or creating the right rubric is not the end. When rubrics are used throughout the learning process, they are uniquely supportive. They can provide actionable feedback, help students set personal learning goals, support rhetorical decision making, clarify targets, and allow students to self-evaluate and monitor their own progress. Setting aside the time for students to work with rubrics in those ways lays the foundation for expert learning.

Appendix A. English Placement Test – Essay Scoring Guide

At each of the six score points for on-topic papers, descriptors of writing performance are lettered to indicate

1. response to the topic
2. understanding and use of the passage
3. quality and clarity of thought
4. organization, development, and support
5. sentence structure and command of language
6. grammar, usage, and mechanics

Score of 6: Superior Response

A 6 essay demonstrates superior writing, but may have minor flaws. A typical essay in this category:

1. addresses the topic clearly and responds effectively to all aspects of the task
2. demonstrates a thorough critical understanding of the passage in developing an insightful response
3. explores the issues thoughtfully and in depth
4. is coherently organized and developed, with ideas supported by apt reasons and well- chosen examples
5. has an effective, fluent style marked by sentence variety and a clear command of language
6. is generally free from errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics

Score of 5: Strong Response

A 5 essay demonstrates clear competence in writing. It may have some errors, but they are not serious enough to distract or confuse the reader. A typical essay in this category:

1. addresses the topic clearly, but may respond to some aspects of the task more effectively than others
2. demonstrates a sound critical understanding of the passage in developing a well- reasoned response
3. shows some depth and complexity of thought
4. is well organized and developed, with ideas supported by appropriate reasons and examples
5. displays some sentence variety and facility in the use of language
6. may have a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics

Score of 4: Proficient Response

A 4 essay demonstrates adequate writing. It may have some problems, but they do not interfere with understanding. A typical essay in this category:

1. addresses the topic, but may not respond to all parts of the task thoroughly
2. demonstrates a generally accurate understanding of the passage in developing a reasonable response
3. provides basic analysis, but may treat the topic repetitively
4. is adequately organized and developed, generally supporting ideas with reasons and examples
5. demonstrates adequate control of sentence structure and language
6. may have some errors, but generally demonstrates control of grammar, usage, and mechanics

Score of 3: Limited Response

A **3** essay demonstrates developing writing, but has some significant problems. A typical essay in this category has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. misunderstands or does not respond to all parts of the task
2. demonstrates a limited understanding of the passage, or makes poor use of it in developing a weak response
3. lacks focus, sometimes fails to communicate ideas, or has weak analysis
4. is poorly organized and developed, presenting generalizations without adequate and appropriate support or presenting details without generalizations
5. demonstrates limited control of sentence structure and language
6. has an accumulation of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that sometimes interfere with meaning

Score of 2: Inadequate Response

A **2** essay demonstrates serious writing problems. A typical essay in this category has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. indicates confusion about the topic or neglects important aspects of the task
2. demonstrates very poor understanding of the main points of the passage, does not use the passage appropriately in developing a response, or may not use the passage at all
3. lacks focus and coherence, and often fails to communicate ideas
4. has very weak organization, development, and support
5. demonstrates inadequate control of sentence structure and language
6. has numerous errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that frequently interfere with meaning

Score of 1: Fundamentally Flawed Response

A **1** essay demonstrates fundamental writing problems. A typical essay in this category has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. fails to respond meaningfully to the topic
2. demonstrates little or no understanding of the passage or does not use it to respond to the topic
3. is unfocused, illogical, or incoherent
4. is disorganized and undeveloped, providing little or no relevant support
5. lacks basic control of sentence structure and language
6. has serious and persistent errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that severely interfere with meaning

Readers should not penalize ESL writers excessively for slight shifts in idiom, problems with articles, confusion over prepositions, and *occasional* misuse of verb tense and verb forms, so long as such features do not obscure meaning.

Appendix B. EPT Rubric Adapted to Address Genre Awareness

	6 – Superior	5 – Strong	4 – Adequate	3 – Marginal	2 – Very Weak	1 – Incompetent
Response to the Topic	Responds effectively to all aspects of the task, focused by a complex understanding of context, audience, and purpose	Addresses the topic clearly, but may respond to some aspects of the task more effectively than others, guided by an understanding of context, audience, and purpose	Addresses the topic, but may slight some aspects of the task, demonstrating adequate attention to context, audience, and purpose	Distorts or neglects aspects of the task, and may demonstrate lapses in attention to context, purpose, and audience	Indicates confusion about the topic and a flawed understanding of the rhetorical situation, or neglects important aspects of the task	Suggests an inability to comprehend the question or to respond meaningfully to the topic and rhetorical situation
Understanding and Use of the Source Material	Demonstrates a thorough critical understanding of the source material	Demonstrates a sound critical understanding of the source material in developing a well-reasoned response	Demonstrates a generally accurate understanding of the source material in developing a sensible response	Demonstrates some understanding of the source material, but may misconstrue parts of it or make limited use of it in developing a weak response	Demonstrates a very poor understanding of the main points of the source material, does not use the source material appropriately in developing a response, or may not use the source material at all	Demonstrates little or no ability to understand the source material or to use it in developing a response
Quality and Clarity of Thought	Explores the issue(s) thoughtfully and in-depth.	Shows some depth and complexity of thought	May treat the topic simplistically or repetitively	Lacks focus, or demonstrates confused or simplistic thinking	Lacks focus and coherence, and often fails to communicate its ideas	Is unfocused, illogical, or incoherent
Organization, Development, and Support	Is coherently organized and supported by apt reasons and well-chosen examples, effectively employing a range of conventions associated with the genre	Is well-organized and developed, supported by appropriate reasons and examples, successfully employing conventions associated with the genre	Is adequately organized and developed, generally supported with reasons and examples, demonstrating attention to conventions associated with the genre	Is poorly organized and developed, presenting generalizations without adequate support or presenting details without generalizations, demonstrating inconsistent attention to genre conventions	Has very weak organization and development, providing simplistic generalizations without support, and demonstrates a limited understanding of how to employ the genre	Is disorganized and undeveloped, providing little or no relevant support, and may disregard basic conventions of the genre

	6 – Superior	5 – Strong	4 – Adequate	3 – Marginal	2 – Very Weak	1 – Incompetent
Syntax and Command of Language	Has an effective, fluid style marked by syntactic variety and clear command of language	Displays some syntactic variety and facility in the use of language	Demonstrates adequate use of syntax and language	Has limited control of syntax and vocabulary	Has inadequate control of syntax and vocabulary	Lacks basic control of syntax and vocabulary
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics	Is generally free from errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics.	May have a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics	May have some errors, but generally demonstrates control of grammar, usage, and mechanics	Has an accumulation of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that sometimes interfere with meaning.	Is marred by numerous errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that frequently interfere with meaning	Has serious and persistent errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that severely interfere with meaning

Appendix C. Activity 19: Considering Your Task and Your Rhetorical Situation – The Rubric

Read the “Rubric for Research or Advocacy Project” that follows. This is the rubric that will be used to assess your performance on the culminating writing task. Then take turns explaining the differences between a score of a “4” and a “3” to a partner.

Rubric for Research or Advocacy Project

Score of 6: A “6” project demonstrates exceptional achievement. It develops a sophisticated line of reasoning appropriate to the genre and context using reading-based argumentation. The evidence is significant and credible. The writer’s choices are strategic and impactful, effectively and compellingly conveying the writer’s message to the intended audience. An exceptional project attends to audience needs, interests, and expectations and communicates its central ideas to the audience through an engaging and appropriate form and style. It also demonstrates mature control over language choices and a sophisticated understanding of the issue. Design choices (including the use of genre features) expertly focus the audience’s attention on key claims or messages. In addition, the project clearly and skillfully addresses a shared need or problem and offers a relevant and insightful response. The text(s) produced make(s) a meaningful contribution to the conversation by offering new or deeper understandings of the issue and/or by promoting significant responses to the issue.

Score of 5: A “5” project demonstrates commendable achievement. It grounds its claims in evidence and develops a line of reasoning appropriate to the genre and context using reading-based argumentation. The writer’s choices are skillful and informed, effectively conveying the writer’s message to the intended audience. While a commendable project attends to audience needs, interests, and expectations, it may be less responsive and nuanced than a “6” project. It nevertheless still communicates its central ideas to the audience through an appropriate form and style. The project also demonstrates control over language choices and a strong understanding of the issue. Design choices focus the audience’s attention on key claims or messages. In addition, the project clearly addresses a shared need or problem and offers a relevant response. The text(s) produced contribute(s) to the conversation by offering new or deeper understandings of the issue and/or by promoting productive responses to the issue.

Score of 4: A “4” project demonstrates adequate achievement. It uses evidence to develop a reading-based argument appropriate to the genre and context. The writer’s choices are generally appropriate for the audience and purpose. This project may show less attention to or awareness of audience needs, interests, and expectations. It communicates its ideas to the audience through a generally appropriate form and style although it may occasionally lapse into rhetorical choices not suited to the rhetorical situation. It also demonstrates adequate control over language choices and an adequate (or occasionally superficial) understanding of the issue. Design choices may not consistently help focus the audience’s attention on key claims or messages. In addition, the project addresses a shared need or problem and offers an appropriate response. The text(s) produced joins(s) the conversation by offering additional information or understandings and/or by calling for an appropriate response to the issue.

Score of 3: A “3” project demonstrates limited achievement. The writer may have neglected to meet all the project requirements, including requirements for minimum word count and for citation of sources. While the project may include some evidence, the evidence may not be clearly connected to the writer’s claims. Evidence may also be insufficient and/or inappropriate to the genre and audience. The central message may also be unclear or underdeveloped. The audience’s cares and concerns may receive only minimal attention. The need or problem the project addresses may be implied or unsubstantiated, and the relevance and importance of the response may not be clear. The writing may demonstrate occasional lack of control over language choices.

Score of 2: A “2” project represents an inadequate response to the task. In addition to not meeting all the project requirements, this project may also demonstrate a clear disregard for the rhetorical situation. It may neglect to target an intended audience or identify a clear purpose. The message may be unfocused and confusing, and claims may be unsupported and unconvincing. Choices about genre may likewise show little to no consideration for the rhetorical situation. The writing may demonstrate a consistent lack of control over language choices. These projects may also be unacceptably brief.

Score of 1: A “1” project shows little to no evidence of achievement. It compounds the issues represented by a score of “2” through a response to the task that is notably incomplete and/or inappropriate.

Appendix D. Summarizing and Responding – Rhetorical Précis Rubric

Purpose: To help students refine their ability to write a rhetorical précis while using academic English to provide feedback for each other

Ask students to evaluate each other’s précis using the rubric below. If you have not done this before, be sure to explain the purpose of peer response and model how to use the rubric with a sample student rhetorical précis before asking the students to do the activity themselves. You may wish to group students by proficiency level. If this is a graded assignment, use the same rubric to give grades. This activity ramps up the process of summarizing by asking students to not only summarize a text but to articulate the purpose, intended audience, and author’s ethos.

Summarizing and Responding – Rhetorical Précis Rubric

Purpose: The purpose of this activity is for you to apply a rubric to evaluate another student’s rhetorical précis for how accurately it summarizes the argument and organization of the text and the rhetorical strategies of its writer. This experience will provide your peer with guidance for revision and will also help you identify how best to revise your own rhetorical précis.

Rhetorical Précis Rubric

1 = serious problems 2 = developing effectiveness 3 = adequate effectiveness 4= clear effectiveness

1234	Sentence 1 clearly states the author, genre, title of publication and publication date; demonstrates a concise and accurate understanding of the focus of the passage.
1234	Sentence 2 explains how the writer develops and supports the thesis following the organization of the article.
1234	Sentence 3 states the author’s apparent purpose and gives a reason.
1234	Sentence 4 describes the intended audience and the relationship the author has established with his or her readers.

Circle the number in each category that best describes the effectiveness of each sentence in the précis. Add the numbers, and then divide by 4 to get an average score.

Total _____ **Average** _____

Appendix E. Summarizing and Responding – Peer Response (from “Changing Minds: Thinking about Immigration”)

Activity 13: Summarizing and Responding – Peer Response

Use the article with your annotations and statements of what each chunk of the text does and the purpose of each chunk to help you write a summary of the text. Then write your response to Machado’s article and her argument.

1. Write a one-paragraph summary of the article. A summary is a shorter version of the text that contains all of the most essential information and nothing extra. Identify the title and author in your summary and write the entire summary in your own words; do not quote.
2. Write a response to the article (one paragraph). A response is your personal reaction to the text. For example, what personal experiences have you had or what have you read or viewed that cause you to agree and/or disagree? Why?
3. Exchange your summary and response paragraphs with a classmate. Read them carefully and respond to the questions in the Peer Response to Summary and the Peer Response to Response that follow.

Peer Response to Summary	
1. Does the writer include the author’s name in the first sentence of the summary? <i>Writer: Include the author’s name.</i>	Yes No
2. Does the writer include the title of the article in the first sentence of the summary? <i>Writer: Include the title of the article.</i>	Yes No
3. Is the title in quotation marks? <i>Writer: Punctuate the title using quotation marks.</i>	Yes No
4. Does the first sentence clearly state the main idea of the article? <i>Writer: State the main idea in the first sentence. Make sure it is clear and accurate.</i> You can improve your first sentence by _____	Yes No
5. Does the writer include all of the important ideas or supporting points from the article? <i>Writer: You left out an important point (specify which):</i>	Yes No
6. Does the writer use his or her own words to paraphrase the main ideas? <i>Writer: You used the author’s words instead of your own.</i> Give paragraph or line number: ____	Yes No
7. Does the writer keep his or her own opinions out of the summary? <i>Writer: You mentioned your own opinion in the summary. Remember to save your opinion for the response.</i>	Yes No

Peer Response to Response	
1. Does the writer choose one or two ideas from the article to respond to? <i>Writer: Be sure to focus your response on the ideas from the article.</i>	Yes No
2. Does the writer give some personal experience to show why he or she is responding to the article this way? <i>Writer: Be sure to connect your ideas to your personal experience.</i>	Yes No
3. Does the writer avoid summarizing information from the article? <i>Writer: Don't summarize in the response. Assume that the reader has read your summary.</i>	Yes No
4. Does the writer choose one or two ideas from the article to respond to? <i>Writer: Be sure to focus your response on the ideas from the article.</i>	Yes No

Now respond to the following question:

Reflection: What did you learn by providing revision advice and receiving it from your partner?

Appendix F. SBAC Short Write Rubric – Adapted (from “The Distance Between Us”)

Argumentative Rubric (Target: Organization)

2 points

The response

- establishes an adequate claim that articulates the argument(s) presented in the body of writing as a whole
- provides adequate information to frame the argument to put the claim into context
- does more than list arguments to support claim—not formulaic
- provides a logical connection to the body paragraph

1 point

The response

- provides a partial or limited claim
 - provides a claim that partially reflects the argument(s) presented in the body of writing as a whole
 - provides limited and/or extraneous information to frame the argument to put the claim into context
 - may list arguments—formulaic
 - provides a limited and/or awkward connection to the body paragraph

0 points

The response

- provides no claim or provides a claim that is not appropriate for the body of writing as a whole
- provides irrelevant or no information to frame the argument to put the claim into context
- provides no connection to the body paragraph

Appendix G. Rubric for Academic Language Use in Group Discussion (High Impact Strategies Toolkit)

Purpose: To identify strengths and areas for growth in student discussion skills in order to inform instructional planning

As students are participating in any collaborative discussion (for example, collaborative reading, Socratic seminar, or structured academic controversy), use the rubric below to make notes about what you observe about each student’s abilities in participating in academic discussion. Take notes about what students are saying (“Student A agreed with Student B and offered an additional example from the second text.) When the discussion is over, give students specific feedback about the positive exchanges you noted and the areas that students will want to work on in future discussions. Use the same rubric and process each time students participate in a student-centered discussion, so you can observe growth over time. When students create and reflect on their learning goals, the feedback you give can become part of the evidence that they draw on.

	Emergent Proficiency	Developing Proficiency	Advanced Proficiency
Collaborative Discussion	Does not participate in discussions or participates only occasionally; seldom includes other in discussion.	Participates in discussions; sometimes includes others in discussion.	Initiates and participates in discussions in groups; reaches out to include others in discussion.
Listening	Does not listen carefully to what others say; may not understand what others have said.	Listens to what is said and occasionally refers to the ideas of others.	Listens carefully to what is said and regularly refers to the ideas of others.
Evidence	Offers little evidence from either own experience or texts.	Draws on own experience; occasionally refers to texts for evidence.	Draws appropriately on own experience; regularly refers to texts for evidence.
Questioning	Seldom asks or responds to questions.	Asks questions to clarify understanding; responds briefly to questions.	Asks questions about the evidence and reasoning of others; responds fully to questions.
Vocabulary and Syntax	Does not try to use academic sentence starters, new vocabulary, or even simple sentence structures.	Attempts to use a limited number of academic sentence starters, new vocabulary, and sentence structures.	Attempts to use a range of academic sentence starters, new vocabulary, and more complex sentence structures.

Appendix H. Making Choices as You Write – Class Rubric/Outline for Graduation Speech (from “Ready to Launch”)

Purpose: To establish clear expectations around genre conventions and organizational structures

Working as a class to create a rubric for the speech, based on the student-generated list of genre conventions, may be a good way to have students start writing from a place of relative confidence about the task. A rubric can easily serve as a kind of outline for many students, while others will have their own ideas about creative organization and structure.

With a rubric/outline in place, consider having students work on one feature of the speech at a time until it is as nearly perfect as it can be. It is hard to move from a weak or tentative welcome and recognition of occasion into the next part of the speech, whatever it might be. Breaking the work into smaller tasks, supported by the rubric/outline and information from how-to sites, may result in early and sustainable success. Encourage students to adapt the genre features and composing advice to their unique situation.

The rubric can also be used to initiate a conversation about grading, points, and end-of-the-year accountability. A good rubric can make the work of grading the speeches quite fast and pleasurable, and it might help with student understanding and engagement if students are involved to some extent in the process of developing the rubric.

In your role as facilitator and rubric designer, you will create the structural outline that many students will follow. Discussions about where to locate “thank yous” or when to recognize visitors by group (parents, distinguished guests, etc.) may be necessary as students begin to draft. Stress to students that they will be able to move pieces around after they are written; their speech is not set in stone in the first draft.

If it has not yet been discussed, this is an ideal opportunity to address presentation choices. Will you allow students to make videos? If so, what additional rubric items might you need to include?

Students should begin writing after this group rubric creating activity. Inspire and require them to do so by setting a clear date for completion of a first draft at this time.

Activity 14: Making Choices as You Write – Class Rubric/Outline

We will work as class, using the learning goals listed in Activity 4 and the personal goals you created as a result, to develop a rubric for your graduation speeches. The rubric will serve two purposes: it will be used to score the speeches as they are presented, and it will serve as an outline for your writing. An outline roughly lays out how the finished work will flow by listing specific sections, from beginning through middle to end. An outline grows from most basic (beginning, middle, end) to a detailed map by adding to each section. For example, the end of a speech may contain a return to its main theme or purpose, an expression of gratitude, a fond farewell, or a final inspiration or send-off. It might contain all of those plus a call to action or a hope for the future. A well-developed outline makes any writing task more approachable. You may decide to create your own structural outline, which is fine as long as it contains all of the rubric items. A good outline will allow you to think about the whole composition while working on a single part of it.

The rubric we create will assess the following aspects of your speech:

- Clarity of theme
- Appropriateness of tone
- Mindful incorporation and consideration of genre conventions appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion
- Effective structure
- Delivery

In groups of four, determine the criteria for a four-point rubric. What criteria with regard to each of the bulleted elements above would you like to see evaluated? Work together in your group to complete a rubric draft that shows the continuum from someone who has not met the requirement to someone who is nearing the requirement to someone who has met the requirement to someone who has excelled in meeting the requirement. For example, the “effective structure” component criteria might look something like this:

Element	Score 1: Does not meet standard	Score 2: Approaching standard	Score 3: Meets standard	Score 4: Exceeds standard
Structure	Speech has no sense of structure or organization	Speech attempts a sense of structure or organization, but the audience may feel lost during the delivery	Speech has a clear and defined sense of beginning, middle, and end	Speech purposefully guides the audience and returns to the main theme to give the speech a sense of coming full circle

Once all groups have developed a rubric, we’ll work to compile into a common class rubric and determine the elements necessary for a student to score a 1, 2, 3, or 4. This common rubric will be used to assess everyone’s graduation speech.

This is a good time to ask any questions you have about presenting your speech and whether you will need to submit a final draft of it and in what format. You may also have random questions about appropriate words or stories, jokes, quotations, and clever shout-outs. You may want to know if you can use a language other than English in your speech. This is a good forum in which to bring these kinds of questions up for discussion.

At the end of this activity, you should be clear about how to begin and proceed with your first draft, which is exactly what you should do next.

Appendix I. Speech Rubric (from “Remembering Injustice”)

Criteria	Effectively Accomplished	Partially Accomplished	Not Accomplished
Attention Getter	Effective use of an attention getting strategy (quote, statistic, question, story, etc.) to capture listeners’ attention and to introduce topic. Attention getter is relevant and meaningful to the topic.	Use of relevant attention getting strategy. Connection to topic may be loose or questionable.	No attention getting strategy was evident or no clear or relevant connection to speech topic and purpose.
Connection w/Audience	Clearly connected the relevance of the topic to audience needs and interests. Audience analysis reflected through framing of the topic and supporting evidence.	Connection to audience is there but not explicitly stated. Limited audience analysis reflected in topic and evidence framing.	No attempt made to connect topic to the targeted audience.
Subject Knowledge	Speech reflects a depth of understanding of the topic and its significance.	Speech reflects a limited understanding of the topic and its significance.	Speech reflects little understanding of the topic and its significance.
Organization	Speech is effectively organized to accomplish its purpose. Signposts/transitions create smooth and coherent transitions.	Organization may be adequate but not effective. Transitions may be sporadic or confusing.	Lack of structure, or lack of transitions.
Language	Language is appropriate for the occasion, audience, and purpose.	Language is mostly appropriate for the occasion, audience, and purpose, but may occasionally slip in tone or register.	Language is largely inappropriate for the occasion, audience, and purpose.
Credibility	Speaker builds credibility by citing experts when appropriate. Written copy of the speech includes a bibliography/works cited page.	Speaker lacks authoritative sources or over-relies on hearsay. Includes a bibliography/works cited page.	No attempt to cite experts. No bibliography/works cited page.
Voice/Fluency	Effective variation of rate, pitch, volume and tone to heighten interest and match the message of the speech.	Limited variation of rate, pitch, volume, and tone. Delivery may be flat or may do little to amplify the message of the speech.	Rate, pitch, volume or tone such that the speaker is difficult to understand or follow.

Appendix J. ERWC Prior-Knowledge Writing Assessment Rubric

(Purpose: To evaluate students' proficiencies for mastery of 9th-10th grade Common Core State Standards)

Name _____

Period _____

Learning Goals Assessed	Identify the central idea of a text and its development over the course of the text, and provide an objective summary. RI.9-10.2	Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. W.9-10.1	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task and purpose. W.9-10.4
4 Exceeding Standard(s) <i>(demonstrating competence at 11-12th grade standard(s))</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies multiple central ideas • Analyzes the development of central ideas, and how they interact and build on each other • Analyzes the role of supporting ideas to the central idea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the rhetoric of the argument • Analyzes a substantive topic or text • Introduces a precise claim and establish its significance • Provides reasons and evidence from substantive topic or text to support claim • Identifies and develops claims and counterclaims fairly (without bias) • Organizes reasons and evidence in a logical manner • Supports assertions through appeal to logic or emotion • Analyzes and address audience considerations, values, and biases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds reasonable expectations of the requirements of the writing task • Determines and addresses the audience appropriately • Understands and utilizes appropriate style for the writing task and the audience
3.5	In addition to score 3.0 performance, partial success at score 4.0 content		
3 Meeting Standard(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States the title and the author of the text • Demonstrates concise understanding of the focus passage • Includes all supporting points and examples • Excludes unnecessary detail and personal opinion • Accurately explains the main idea of the passage • Logically organizes information provided to maintain original organizational pattern • Uses transitions effectively between supporting ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a precise claim, effective reasons, evidence, and support • Explains the relevance of evidence used • Utilizes transitional expressions to establish relationships among claims and reasons • Maintains a formal style and objective tone • Provides an effective conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an understanding of the organizational structure of the specified genre • Addresses the requirements and purpose of the writing task effectively

2.5	In addition to score 2.0 performance, partial success at score 3.0 content		
2 Approaching Standard(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies an idea/claim of the text but not the central idea Includes some reasons in support of the identified claim, but does not follow the development of the argument Provides an overall summary of the text but confuses details with supporting ideas Includes subjective information in the summary and/or omits claims and supporting ideas from summary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers a claim but does not clearly address task or argument Provides reasons, evidence, and support that are irrelevant, off topic, or inconclusive Uses a non-academic or style or a style that is too casual for the audience Provides an inadequate conclusion or no conclusion at all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an external outline of the genre's organizational structure, but does not include the specific elements needed to build an effective supporting argument Attempts to address the requirements of the writing task, but does not fully grasp the purpose of the writing task
1.5	In addition to score 1.0 performance, partial success at score 2.0 content		
1.0 Below Standard(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a lack of understanding of skills required to adequately summarize a text's argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a lack of understanding of the skills required to structure an argument in response to a text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a lack of understanding of genre structure and/or the purpose of the writing task

Comments:

Appendix K. Aspirational Rubric

Aspirational Learning Goals	Commentary (What can be done to improve elements in the composition?)
Organization/Purpose	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective introduction and conclusion 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed 	
Evidence/Elaboration	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear citations or attribution to source material 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective, appropriate style enhances content 	
Conventions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	

Appendix L. Success Criteria for Open Letter (from “Juvenile Justice”)

Activity 31: Making Choices as You Write – Genre of the Open Letter

Purpose: To invite students to analyze an open letter as a mentor text and then create success criteria for evaluating their own letters

Suggested Time: 40 minutes

1. Locate an example of open letter such as the ones below. These are provided as examples, but students will be most engaged by a letter written about an issue that is current when you teach the module. You can find current open letters online by using the search term “What is an open letter?”
Smith, Anna. “Anna Smith: An Open Letter to California’s New Governor.” *Bakersfield.com*, 24 Feb. 2019, www.bakersfield.com/news/anna-smith-an-open-letter-to-california-s-new-governor/article_4bc4c290-370c-11e9-b268-3fa8fa7b8cbc.html. Accessed 27 Feb. 2019.
Watkins, D. “Colin Kaepernick’s Brave Decision: An Open Letter to the 49ers Quarterback.” *Salon*. 9 Sept. 2016, www.salon.com/2016/09/02/colin-kaepernicks-brave-decision-an-open-letter-to-the-49ers-quarterback. Accessed 27 Feb. 2019.
2. Ask them to discuss in triads the questions below about the open letter you are using as a mentor text. Point out that the questions are similar to the ones that they responded to about Jenkins’ open letter in Activity 22: Considering the Rhetorical Situation.
3. Invite students to create a set of success criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of open letters.
4. When all the groups have come up with several criteria for an effective open letter, as a class create a poster, “Success Criteria for an Open Letter.” Tell students that you will evaluate their open letters using the success criteria that they generate (unless, of course, you are using a rubric or other form of assessment). You will want to guide them in creating criteria that look something like the ones below:

Success Criteria for an Open Letter

- Advocates for an issue that the writer feels strongly about
- Addresses a person or group of people who can bring about the desired change but is also intended for the general public
- Makes a clear argument for the writer’s proposed solution
- Develops the analysis by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, details, quotations, or other information or examples including personal information
- Uses precise description, selection of effective details, and vivid vocabulary
- Concludes with a call to action
- Follows the conventions of a published open letter including careful editing

Activity 31: Making Choices as You Write – Genre of the Open Letter

An open letter is a fairly common kind of writing that people do when they feel strongly about an issue. The writer addresses a specific person or group of people who can do something to solve a problem or improve a situation. The writer intends to publish the letter so the intended audience is not just the person to whom the letter is addressed but everyone who has a stake in the issue. One of the most famous open letters is Martin Luther King’s “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” in which he defends non-violence as a way to fight racism.

With your group, talk about the letter you have just read.

1. Who is the letter written to? Where was it published?
2. What issue has caused the writer to write the letter? How does he or she feel about that issue?
3. How effective is the evidence the writer uses?
4. What rhetorical strategies does the writer use to persuade us?
5. What do you notice about the style of the letter?
6. How does the writer conclude the letter?
7. How is the letter different from an academic essay?

Now collaborate with your group to create success criteria for an open letter. List several characteristics that you think all effective open letters should have, based on your review of Jenkin’s letter and the one you have just analyzed.

Success Criteria for an Open Letter

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Appendix M. Open Letter Rubric (from “Juvenile Justice”)

	Superior (3)	Adequate (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Central Issue	Writer advocates for issue so that reader feels writer’s strong feelings about it.	Issue identified without presence of writer’s strong feelings about it.	Issue itself is not sufficiently defined or described so that writer’s feelings are not evident.
Audience Addressed	Audience clearly addressed	Audience implied but obfuscated	Little or no sense of audience addressed
Quality of Argument for Writer’s Solution	Makes a clear argument	Argument apparent but needs greater clarity	Argument occluded or disorganized
Selection of facts, details, quotations, or other information	Significant and relevant	Inconsistent selection of details, quotations, or other information	Neither sufficiently significant nor relevant
Vocabulary	Vivid	Satisfactory	Unclear or faulty usage
Call to Action	Letter concludes with this feature	Hints at call to action but not loud and clear	No concluding call to action
Conventions of Letter	Conventions followed with careful editing	Some issues with conventions and editing	Significant problems with conventions and editing

Works Cited

- Frieden, Jeffery. "Guiding Students into Making Real-World Writing Decisions Using 'The Daily Me'/Part 2". *ERWC Online Community*, 9 May 2020, https://calstate.zoom.us/rec/play/6ZwvJrurpmo3E4WR5ASDA_AsW9S9e6msgyYXqPBfzU2wVCMdNgH3MuAWYbdPG8QMzDd0-5ppIdjFb3D2?continueMode=true&xzm_rtaid=hJqROpz6TD2cLgAp_4SJqA.1591032064932.44d3805cf95e5622cb1e081309210dd9&xzm_rhtaid=697
- Panadero, Ernesto and Anders Jonsson. "The Use of Scoring Rubrics for Formative Assessment Purposes Revisited: A Review." *Educational Research Review*, vol. 9, June 2013, pp. 129-144. ERIC, eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ999454. Accessed 31 May 2020.
- "Performance Tasks." *Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Portal*, 2020, <portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/performance-task-writing-rubric-argumentative.pdf>. Accessed 31 May 2020.
- "Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Brief Write Rubrics." Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Portal, October 2015, <portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/brief-write-rubrics.pdf>. Accessed 31 May 2020.
- Stevens, Dannelle and Antonia Levi. *Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback, and Promote Student Learning*. 2nd ed., Stylus, 2013.
- "Writing Rubrics for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California." *The ELPAC Website*, prepared for California Department of Education by the Educational Testing Service, 20 April 2018, www.elpac.org/s/pdf/ELPAC_Writing-Rubrics.pdf. Accessed 31 May 2020.