**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