

Mississippi Academic Assessment Program English Language Arts Grades 6–English II

Draft Short Write Response Rubric—Argumentative

Standard	4 points	3 points	Score of 2 points	1 point	0 points
Purpose, Organization, and Evidence W.1	The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to easily understand the writer's purpose. Ideas are effectively elaborated using relevant, appropriate, sufficient, and accurate evidence and details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used effectively to clarify the relationships between claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing maintains an effective organizational structure that contributes to the cohesiveness and clarity of the response. - The claim is effectively introduced and clearly communicated and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience. - Alternate and opposing argument(s) are effectively acknowledged or addressed. - Evidence from source material(s) (facts and details) is integrated, relevant, and specific. - Introduction and conclusion are thorough and effective. - Elaborative techniques are effectively integrated. - Vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose. - Ideas progress logically from beginning to end with strong connections among ideas. - Argumentative style is used consistently and effectively.	The writing is generally clear and focused and shows a general understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's purpose. Ideas are adequately elaborated using appropriate and accurate evidence and details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used generally to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing maintains an organizational structure that contributes to the cohesiveness and clarity of the response. - The stated claim is clearly communicated and the focus is generally maintained for the purpose and audience. - Alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed. - Adequate evidence from source material(s) (facts and details) is integrated and generally relevant. - An introduction and conclusion are present and adequate. - Elaborative techniques are adequately integrated. - Vocabulary is mostly appropriate for the audience and purpose. - Ideas progress logically from beginning to end with general connections among ideas. - Argumentative style is used consistently and adequately.	The writing is vague and shows only partial understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates some progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's thoughts. Ideas are somewhat developed using some evidence from the source materials. Words, clauses, and transitions are used somewhat consistently to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains a basic beginning and end that contributes to cohesiveness but results in a formulaic structure. - A claim is stated, but may be unclear with limited or incomplete support, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and audience. - Alternate and opposing argument(s) may be minimally addressed or confusing. - Some evidence (facts, details) from source material(s) may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, or vague. - An introduction and/or conclusion are evident. - Elaborative techniques are weakly integrated or confusing. - Vocabulary is somewhat appropriate, but largely ineffective for the audience and purpose. - Relationships among Ideas are vague, inconsistent, or unclear at times. - Argumentative style is used inconsistently and may interfere with the focus.	The writing is unclear and shows a lack of understanding of the given task. The writing shows an attempt at organizing, but the progression of ideas is not always logical, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer's thoughts. Ideas are developed with little to no evidence from the source material(s), and facts and details are irrelevant and/or inaccurate. Words, clauses, and transitions are used minimally and sometimes ineffectively to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains a beginning and end that are inappropriate and/or disconnected, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity. - A claim may be stated ambiguously and have limited or no support; response focus may drift. - Alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged. - Evidence (facts and details) from source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied. - An introduction and/or conclusion may be missing. - Elaborative techniques may be used minimally, if at all; emotional appeal may dominate. - Frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may have an unclear progression. - Vocabulary is limited for the audience and purpose. - Little or no evidence exists of appropriate use of argumentative style.	The writing is unclear, shows no understanding of the given task, and uses no reasoning and no evidence from the source material(s). Facts and details are missing, irrelevant, and/or inaccurate. The writing lacks a progression of ideas, making it difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or thoughts. Words, clauses, and transitions are lacking or used ineffectively and confuse the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing lacks a beginning and ending, resulting in a loss of cohesiveness and clarity. - Response may be too brief to present an argument, or support is inadequate and confusing. Response focus drifts. - Alternate and opposing argument(s) are not acknowledged. - Evidence (facts and details) from source material(s) is absent. - The writing makes no use of elaborative techniques; emotional appeal may dominate. - Vocabulary is ineffective for the audience and purpose. - Little or no evidence exists of appropriate argumentative style.
Language and Usage L.1, L.2, L.3			Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful. Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure. The writing may contain a few minor errors in grammar and usage, but they do not interfere with meaning. The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a few minor errors in mechanics, but they do not interfere with meaning. - Contains few, if any, errors in usage and conventions; does not contain errors that interfere with meaning. - Demonstrates adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses mostly correct verb tense. - Uses mostly correct subject and verb agreement.	Word choice is limited, clichéd, and repetitive. Sentences show little or no variety in length and structure, and some may be awkward, leading to monotonous reading. The writing may contain a pattern of errors in grammar and usage that occasionally impedes meaning. The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a pattern of errors in mechanics that occasionally impedes meaning. - Contains errors in usage and conventions that sometimes interfere with meaning. - Demonstrates limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses some correct verb tense. - Uses some correct subject and verb agreement.	Words are functional and simple and/or may be inappropriate to the task. The sentences may contain errors in construction or are simple and lack variety, making the essay difficult to read. The writing may contain frequent errors in grammar and usage that significantly impede meaning. The writing demonstrates limited command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain frequent errors in mechanics that significantly impede meaning. - Contains frequent errors in usage and conventions that often interfere with meaning. - Demonstrates infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses little or no correct verb tense. - Uses little or no correct subject and verb agreement.

Mississippi Academic Assessment Program English Language Arts Grades 6–English II

Draft Short Write Response Rubric—Informative/Explanatory

Standard	Score or				
	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Purpose, Organization, and Evidence W.2	The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a purposeful, logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to easily follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are effectively elaborated using relevant, appropriate, and accurate evidence and details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used effectively to clarify the relationships among reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing maintains an effective organizational structure appropriate to the task that contributes to the cohesiveness and clarity of the response. - Central idea or topic is clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience. - Comprehensive facts and details from the source material(s) are effectively integrated, relevant, and specific. - Ideas progress logically from beginning to end; connections among ideas are clear and effective. - Introduction and conclusion are effective. - Vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose. - Expository style is used consistently and effectively.	The writing is generally clear and focused and shows a general understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are adequately elaborated using appropriate and accurate evidence and details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used generally to clarify the relationships among reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing maintains an organizational structure that contributes to the cohesiveness and clarity of the response. - Central idea or topic is evident, and a general focus is maintained for the purpose and audience. - Facts and details from source material(s) are integrated and generally relevant to the controlling idea. - Ideas are generally related and adequately progress from beginning to end; connections among ideas may be general but are adequate. - Introduction and conclusion are present. - Vocabulary is mostly appropriate for the audience and purpose. - The writing demonstrates generally appropriate and consistent expository style.	The writing is vague and shows only partial understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates some progression of ideas that allow the reader to follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are somewhat developed using some evidence from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used somewhat consistently to clarify the relationships among reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains a basic beginning and end that contributes to a cohesiveness that may be formulaic in structure. - Central idea or topic may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience. - Some facts and details from source materials may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague and/or copied. - Writing displays uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end and/or is formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections exist among ideas. - Introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak. - Vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose. - Writing shows inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate expository style.	The writing is unclear and shows a lack of understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates an attempt at organizing, but the progression of ideas is not always logical, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer’s message or thoughts. Ideas are developed with little to no evidence from the source material(s), and facts and details are irrelevant and/or inaccurate. Words, clauses, and transitions are used minimally and sometimes ineffectively to clarify the relationships among reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains a beginning and end that are inappropriate and/or disconnected, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity. - Central idea or topic may be confusing or ambiguous; response focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience. - Facts and details from source material(s) are minimal, and/or irrelevant. - Frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas display an unclear relationship and/or progression. - Introduction and/or conclusion may be missing. - Vocabulary use is limited or inappropriate for the audience and purpose. - Writing displays little evidence of appropriate expository style.	The writing is unclear, shows no understanding of the given task, and uses no reasoning and no evidence from the source material(s). Facts and details are missing, irrelevant, and/or inaccurate. The writing demonstrates a lack of progression in ideas, making it difficult for the reader to follow the writer’s message or thoughts. Words, clauses, and transitions are lacking or used ineffectively and confuse the relationships among reasons, details, and/or evidence. There is a lack of a beginning and ending, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity. - Central idea or topic may be missing; response may be too brief. - Facts and details from source materials are absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied. - Ideas may be randomly ordered. - Introduction and/or conclusion are missing. - Vocabulary use is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose. - No evidence exists of appropriate expository style.
Language and Usage L.1, L.2, L.3			Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful. Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure. The writing may contain a few minor errors in grammar and usage, but they do not interfere with meaning. The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a few minor errors in mechanics, but they do not interfere with meaning. - Contains few, if any, errors in usage and conventions; does not contain errors that interfere with meaning. - Displays adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses mostly correct verb tense. - Uses mostly correct subject and verb agreement.	Word choice is limited, clichéd, and repetitive. Sentences show little or no variety in length and structure, and some may be awkward, leading to monotonous reading. The writing may contain a pattern of errors in grammar and usage that occasionally impedes meaning. The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a pattern of errors in mechanics that occasionally impedes meaning. - Contains errors in usage and conventions that sometimes interfere with meaning. - Displays limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses some correct verb tense. - Uses some correct subject and verb agreement.	Words are functional and simple and/or may be inappropriate to the task. The sentences may contain errors in construction or are simple and lack variety, making the essay difficult to read. The writing may contain frequent errors in grammar and usage that impede meaning. The writing demonstrates limited command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain egregious errors in mechanics that impede meaning. - Contains frequent errors in usage and conventions that often interfere with meaning. - Displays infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. - Uses little or no correct verb tense. - Uses little or no correct subject and verb agreement.

Mississippi Academic Assessment Program English Language Arts Grades 6–English II
Draft Short Write Response Rubric—Narrative

Standard	Score of				
	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Purpose, Organization, and Evidence W.3	The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a purposeful, logical progression of events that allow the reader to easily follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are effectively elaborated using relevant, appropriate, and accurate details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used effectively to clarify the relationships among characters and events. The writing maintains an effective organizational structure appropriate to the task that contributes to cohesiveness and clarity of the response. • An effective plot helps to create a sense of unity and completeness, with an appropriate beginning and end. • Setting is effectively established and/or maintained; characters and events are effectively developed. • Relationships among events and characters are clear and consistent. • Events are sequenced logically from beginning to end. • Language (sensory, concrete, and/or figurative) is used effectively to advance the plot. • Connections to source materials enhance the narrative. • Narrative style is used appropriately, effectively, and consistently.	The writing is generally clear and focused and shows a general understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates a progression of events that allow the reader to follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are adequately elaborated using appropriate and accurate details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used generally to clarify the relationships among characters and events. The writing maintains an organizational structure that contributes to the cohesiveness and clarity of the response. • A general plot creates a sense of unity and completeness with a beginning and end, although minor flaws may exist, and some ideas may be loosely connected. • Characters, setting, and events are adequately developed. • Relationships among events and characters may be general but are evident. • Events are generally sequenced from beginning to end. • Language (sensory, concrete, and/or figurative) exists that generally advances the purpose. • Connections to source material(s) contribute to the narrative. • Narrative style is used and generally consistent.	The writing is vague and shows only partial understanding of the given task. The writing demonstrates some progression of events that allow the reader to follow the writer’s thoughts. Ideas are somewhat developed using some details from the source material(s). Words, clauses, and transitions are used somewhat consistently to clarify the relationships among characters and events. The writing contains a basic beginning and end that contributes to a cohesiveness that may be formulaic in structure. • Plot unevenly or minimally establishes a setting and develops the narrator and/or characters. The beginning and/or end may be weak or missing. • Characters, setting, and events are illogically or inconsistently developed. • Displays weak or illogical sequence of events. • Displays partial or weak use of language (sensory, concrete, and figurative) and may not advance the purpose. • Connections to source material(s) may be ineffective, awkward, or vague and may or may not interfere with the narrative. • Demonstrates inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate narrative style.	The writing is unclear and shows a lack of understanding of the given task. The writing shows an attempt at organization, but the progression of events is not always logical, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer’s message or thoughts. Ideas are developed with little to no details from the source material(s), and descriptions and details are irrelevant and/or inaccurate. Words, clauses, and transitions are used minimally and sometimes ineffectively to clarify the relationships among characters and events. The writing contains a beginning and end that are inappropriate and/or disconnected, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity. • Experiences, characters, setting, and events may be vague and lack clarity with little discernible plot. • Content may be brief or displays little attempt to establish a setting, narrator, and/or characters. • Demonstrates minimal organization of an event sequence; major drift may be evident. • Introduction and/or conclusion may be missing. • May display little use of sensory, concrete, or figurative language; language does not advance the purpose. • Connections to source materials, if evident, may detract from the narrative. • Displays little evidence of appropriate narrative style.	The writing is unclear, shows no understanding of the given task, and does not connect to the source material(s). Descriptions and details are missing, irrelevant, and/or inaccurate. The writing demonstrates a lack in progression of events, making it difficult for the reader to follow the writer’s message or thoughts. Words, clauses, and transitions are lacking or used ineffectively and confuse the relationships among characters and events. There is no evident beginning or ending, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity. • Displays no discernible plot or merely presents a series of events. • Demonstrates no attempt to establish a setting, narrator, and/or characters. • Displays no organization of an event sequence; includes frequent extraneous ideas. • Introduction and/or conclusion are missing. • Exhibits few or no connections to source materials. • Displays little or no use of sensory, concrete, or figurative language; language interferes with the purpose. • Narrative style may be absent or incorrect.
Language and Usage L.1, L.2, L.3			Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful. Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure. The writing may contain a few minor errors in grammar and usage, but they do not interfere with meaning. The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a few minor errors in mechanics, but they do not interfere with meaning. • Contains few, if any, errors in usage and conventions; does not contain errors that interfere with meaning. • Displays adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. • Uses mostly correct verb tense. • Uses mostly correct subject and verb agreement.	Word choice is limited, clichéd, and repetitive. Sentences show little or no variety in length and structure, and some may be awkward, leading to monotonous reading. The writing may contain a pattern of errors in grammar and usage that occasionally impedes meaning. The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a pattern of errors in mechanics that occasionally impedes meaning. • Contains errors in usage and conventions that sometimes interfere with meaning. • Displays limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. • Uses some correct verb tense.	Words are functional and simple and/or may be inappropriate to the task. The sentences may contain errors in construction or are simple and lack variety, making the essay difficult to read. The writing may contain frequent errors in grammar and usage that impede meaning. The writing demonstrates limited command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain egregious errors in mechanics that impede meaning. • Contains frequent errors in usage and conventions that often interfere with meaning. • Displays infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling. • Uses little or no correct verb tense.