**Claims, Evidence and Reasoning – Scientific Explanations Rubric Linked to SBAC Argumentative Writing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Claim** – a conclusion that answers the original question | * Scientifically accurate
* Completely answers the question
* Common inaccurate claim(s) are clearly addressed.
 | * Scientifically accurate
* Nearly completely answers the question
* Inaccurate claim(s) are only generally addressed, no specifics
 | * Partially scientifically accurate
* Partially answers the question
* Inaccurate claim(s) are not addressed
 | * Is not scientifically accurate overall
* Does not adequately answer the question
 | No claim |
| **Evidence** – scientific data that supports the claim | * The data are scientifically appropriate to support the claim.
* The data are thorough and convincing – enough details and evidence provided.
* Proper units are used in data
* Shows with evidence why alternate claims do not work
 | * The data are scientifically appropriate to support the claim
* The data are basically sufficient and convincing, but tend to be more general and not as specific and in depth
* Does not address why alternate claims do not work
* Evidence may be repetitive
 | * The data relate to the claim, but are not entirely scientifically appropriate
* The data are not sufficient, though generally support the claim
 | * There is some evidence provided, but it is not logically linked to the claim or scientifically appropriate
 | No evidence provided |
| **Reasoning** – a justification that links the claim and evidence | * Reasoning clearly links evidence to claim
* Shows why the data count as evidence by using appropriate scientific principles
* There are sufficient scientific principles to make links clear between claim and evidence
 | * Reasoning adequately links claim to evidence
* Includes related scientific principles, but only passably clarifies why this data count as evidence
* Reasoning tends to be more general and shows only partial depth of content understanding
 | * Reasoning does not adequately link claim to evidence, or clarify why data count as evidence
* Includes related and non-related scientific principles, and shows little depth of content understanding
 | * Reasoning is clearly insufficient and relates only tangentially to question and claim at hand
* Scientific understanding is very limited
 | Does not provide reasoning |
| **Language and Vocabulary** | * Response clearly and effectively expresses ideas using precise, scientifically appropriate descriptions and vocabulary
 | * Response adequately expresses ideas and scientifically appropriate descriptions and vocabulary, but they are more general than specific
 | * Response inconsistently and sometimes inappropriately expresses ideas or scientific descriptions and vocabulary
 | * Scientific language and vocabulary are not precise or appropriate
 | Not under- standable |
| **Focus and Organization** | * Focus only on question at hand
* Logical progression of ideas
* Clearly stated and focused claim that is strongly maintained
 | * Focus mainly on question at hand, some loosely connected material present
* Logical progression of ideas
* Clearly stated and focused claim that is adequately maintained
 | * Focus not consistent on question at hand
* Progression of ideas not entirely logical
* Have a claim, but it’s not entirely clear or maintained
 | * Focus not at all consistent
* Progression of ideas not logical
* Have an unclear claim that is not maintained
 | No clear focus or organiza-tion  |

Rubric adapted by Kevin J. B. Anderson from K. McNeill and J. Krajcik, NSTA, and SBAC Argumentative Writing Rubric for grades 6-11