**AP Scoring Rubric** Essay: **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Per: \_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** |
| 9/8 | * Responds to the prompt clearly, directly, and fully
* Approaches the text analytically
* Supports a coherent thesis with adequate, sophisticated grounds
* Grounds are taken from a variety of contents, not just one are *(ie: not just 2 lit examples)*
* Backing is well developed, specific, and sophisticated
* Counterclaim/rebuttal adds to writer’s credibility and develops writer’s argument
* Sophisticated language is used in combination with style and voice
* Has no mechanical or grammatical errors
 |
| 7/6 | * Responds to the assignment clearly and directly, but with less development or sophistication than an 8-9 paper
* Supports thesis with appropriate grounds
* Grounds are taken from a variety of contents, not just one are *(ie: not just 2 lit examples)*
* Backing analyzes key ideas, but lacks the clarity or depth of an 8-9 essay
* Counterclaim/rebuttal is present and adds to/strengthens argument
* Writing is well organized with sophisticated transitions
* Moments of style or voice present
* Written in a way that is forceful and clear with very few grammatical errors
 |
| 5 | * Addressed the topic intelligently, but does not answer it specifically and/or deeply
* Shows a general/vague grasp of the argument/concept
* Specific grounds present; may be derived from the same content *(ie: 2 lit examples)*
* Backing is present, but could be analyzed with more depth
* Writer may need to write a stronger “loop” to their thesis/overall argument
* Counterclaim/rebuttal that supports argument is included
* Writing is clear and organized, but may be somewhat mechanical
* Little voice or style elements present
* Grammatical and mechanical errors present
 |
| 4/3 | * Topic is addressed at the surface level
* Thesis is weak or unoriginal; may be lacking a “so what” phrase
* Grounds may be weak, non-specific, or taken from the same content
* Backing analysis may be inadequate, vague, and/or based on a misreading of the text
* No counterclaim/rebuttal is provided
* Writing contains lapses in organization and clarity; may need transitions/structure
* No original style or voice shines through writing
* Undermined by prevalent errors in grammar and mechanics
 |
| 2/1 | * Combines two or more serious errors:
* Does not address the actual assignment
* Indicates a serious misreading of the text/quotation
* Does not offer sufficient grounds
* Analysis is weak, seemingly non-existent, which leads to a weak argument
* Is unclear, poorly written, or unacceptably brief
* Is marked by egregious errors
* Is written with great style, but devoid of content
 |

**Argument Essay Revision Feedback**

***Utilize these suggestions to revise and improve!***

**What you did especially well:**

1. Addresses/answers the prompt.
2. Excellent organization/correct format.
3. Developed, high-quality thesis.
4. Great introduction.
5. Good conclusion.
6. Good use of college-level words/vocab.
7. Impressive grounds!
8. Great use of counterclaim to strengthen argument!
9. Stylistic writing evident.
10. Strong topic/claim sentences.
11. Great variety of transitions.
12. Great “loop” sentences.

**What you need to improve and why:**

**Focus**

1. Does not answer the prompt.
2. Thesis is missing or is not the final sentence of your introduction
3. Thesis does not have a “so what” clause.
4. Straying from the subject/topic/point.
5. So what? Make loop to thesis/overall argument more clear.

**Organization**

1. Ideas do not flow or logically follow one another—use transitions or re-order.
2. Paragraph organization is unclear.
3. Paragraph order should be claim (topic sentence), grounds, backing (analysis), loop to overall argument (thesis)
4. Are you qualifying? Unclear.
5. “Loop” (connect) to your thesis in final sentence of paragraphs.
6. Transitions needed.

**Grounds (Evidence)**

1. Specific GREASES for evidence needed.
2. Do not use hypothetical grounds—give a real example (GREASES).
3. Try to use stronger, more clear/concrete grounds.

**Backing (Analysis)**

1. Backing (analysis) of grounds is too vague—be more specific and explain more thoroughly.
2. Backing should support grounds.
3. Add more explanation to develop your backing with greater detail (add another “because” statement, example, quote, explanation, etc.).
4. Are you qualifying? Unclear.
5. You need a qualifier to show there are limitations to your argument.
6. Counterclaim unclear/weak.

**Style**

1. Comma issues
2. Choppy sentence(s)--sentence combining needed.
3. Vary sentence structure.
4. Vary transitions.
5. Word choice is repetitive.
6. Errors in spelling, word choice, or SVA.
7. Write with a sophisticated, academic tone.
8. Try to add more sophisticated vocabulary and style elements to increase score.

**Conventions**

1. Correct vague pronouns (no “you” or “their”).
2. Keep tense consistent.
3. Do not use conjunctions to begin sentences.
4. Do not use “I”; rewrite in 3rd person.