

# MeTEOR Performance Task

## English III

English Language Arts  
*More Powerful as One*



800-699-7516 | [meteoreducation.com](http://meteoreducation.com)

**MeTEOR**  
CONNECTING THE DOTS

## **Performance Task Item: More Powerful as One**

*Grade Level: English III*

**Focus Areas:** Informational Text; Argument Writing

**Essential Question:** Does History repeat itself?

### **Learning Targets:**

- Students will identify and explain how textual evidence supports what the author states directly and what he/she implies.
- Students will determine the quality of the evidence used to support what the text says.
- Students will explain how specific individuals, ideas, or events interact and develop throughout the text.
- Students will identify figurative language in an informational text.
- Students will identify the structure of an author's exposition or argument and evaluate its effectiveness for his/her purpose(s).
- Students will determine whether an author's structure makes his or her points clear, convincing, and interesting.
- Students will explain how the author's style and content contribute to the power, persuasiveness, or beauty of the text.
- Students will outline and explain the reasoning in key U.S. texts.
- Students will outline and explain the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy.
- Students will participate in a variety of discussions, building on others' ideas, while expressing their own ideas clearly and convincingly.
- Students will write a claim(s) and support it with valid reasons and enough evidence to build an argument that analyzes a topic or a text.

## **STANDARDS**

### **Content Standards:**

- Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.
- Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze how an author uses and refines the meaning of a key term or terms over the course of a text (e.g., how Madison defines faction in Federalist No. 10).

- Analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the structure an author uses in his or her exposition or argument, including whether the structure makes points clear, convincing, and engaging.
- Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text in which the rhetoric is particularly effective, analyzing how style and content contribute to the power, persuasiveness, or beauty of the text.
- Delineate and evaluate the reasoning in seminal U.S. texts, including the application of constitutional principles and use of legal reasoning (e.g., in U.S. Supreme Court majority opinions and dissents) and the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy (e.g., *The Federalist*, presidential addresses).
- Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.
- Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.

## **Materials/Resources:**

- Lincoln's *House Divided* Speech Lexile 1250
- Constructed Response Rubric
- Teacher Resource for Socratic Seminar
- Socratic Seminar Rubric
- Argument Rubric

**Part A:**

**Read Lincoln’s *House Divided* Speech. Then answer questions 1 - 4.**

1. What did Lincoln mean when he said, “A house divided against itself cannot stand”?  
(DOK 2)
2. What was the first point made about the Dred Scott Decision according to Lincoln?  
(DOK 1)
3. What reasons does Lincoln give in the text for fighting the war? Use specific lines from the speech. (DOK 2)

4. Analyze in detail the structure of the speech, including the role of particular paragraphs in developing and refining key concepts. (DOK 2)

## Part B:

### 5. You will participate in a Socratic Seminar.

Complete a close second reading of the speech marking the text as you read. Mark words, sentences, portions of the text that you agree/disagree with, find interesting, think are important, or are confusing. Make note of all questions that you would like to ask.

The seminar leader will provide you with the rules of engagement and ask questions to open the seminar, to keep it moving, and to close the seminar. Your goal as a participant is to:

- ✓ Demonstrate respect for the learning process; have patience with different opinions and complexity; show initiative by asking others for clarification: bring others into the conversation, move the conversation forward; speak to all of the participants; and avoid talking too much.
- ✓ Understand question before answering; cite evidence from text; express thoughts in complete sentences; move conversation forward; make connections between ideas; resolve apparent contradictory ideas; consider others' viewpoints, not only your own; and avoid bad logic.
- ✓ Pay attention to details; write down questions; respond taking into account all participants; demonstrate that you have kept up; point out faulty logic respectfully; and overcome distractions.
- ✓ Be thoroughly familiar with the text; have notations and questions in the margins; key words, phrases, and ideas are highlighted; possible contradictions identified; and pronounce words correctly.

**Part C:**

6. Write an argument to support a claim in an analysis of the speech, *House Divided*. **Did Lincoln make his argument credible? Why or Why Not?** Use sufficient evidence from the text to support your claim. (DOK 3)

## ARTICLE/RUBRICS

---

<http://www.ushistory.org/documents/housedivided.htm> Lexile 1250

### *Lincoln's House Divided Speech*

---

June 16, 1858, at the Illinois Republican convention

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let anyone who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination — piece of machinery, so to speak — compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider, not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted, but also let him study the history of its construction and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the states by state constitutions and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery and was the first point gained.

But, so far, Congress only had acted; and an endorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty," other-wise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any



one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows:

It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into a territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people there-of perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty" and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska Bill was passing through Congress, a law case, involving the question of a Negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then into a territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the district of Missouri; and both Nebraska Bill and lawsuit were brought to a decision in the same month of May 1854. The Negro's name was Dred Scott, which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers: "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly 400,000 votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement. The Supreme Court met again, did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument.

The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the Court; but the incoming President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska Bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital endorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained!

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska Bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not in any just sense made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair

vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration, that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind — the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle! If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine.

Under the Dred Scott decision, "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding; like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back into loose sand; helped to carry an election and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton constitution involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point — the right of a people to make their own constitution — upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are:

First, that no Negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any state in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the Negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states."

Second, that, "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Third, that whether the holding a Negro in actual slavery in a free state makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave state the Negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately but, if acquiesced in for awhile, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott in the free state of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or 1,000 slaves, in Illinois or in any other free state.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are; and partially, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter to go back and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only

to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough, now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all.

Why was the amendment expressly declaring the right of the people voted down? Plainly enough, now, the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the Court decision held up? Why even a senator's individual opinion withheld till after the presidential election? Plainly enough, now, the speaking out then would have damaged the "perfectly free" argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the endorsement? Why the delay of a reargument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-endorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance — and when we see these timbers joined together and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, not omitting even scaffolding, or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in — in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

### Constructed Response Rubric

Score Point	Descriptor
3	<p>The 3 response fully accomplishes the task requirements. It</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• includes a complete interpretation that goes beyond the text,</li> <li>• has clear logic or reasoning, and</li> <li>• provides specific, relevant support from the text.</li> </ul>
2	<p>The 2 response adequately accomplishes the task requirements. It</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• includes an adequate interpretation,</li> <li>• may have minor flaws in logic or reasoning, and</li> <li>• provides general but relevant support from the text.</li> </ul>
1	<p>The 1 response minimally accomplishes the task requirements. It</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• includes a minimal interpretation,</li> <li>• may have gaps in understanding or flaws in logic or reasoning, and</li> <li>• may provide sparse or irrelevant support from the text.</li> </ul>
0	<p>The 0 response does not accomplish the task requirements. It</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may provide no support from the text,</li> <li>• may be limited to information copied directly from the text and presented as the student's own ideas, and</li> <li>• may be incorrect or illogical.</li> </ul>

### **\*\*\*Teacher Resource for Socratic Seminar**

Here are five steps that will help you have a successful Socratic Seminar.

#### **Step 1: Choose a Text**

The purpose of Socratic seminars is to use evidence to support interpretations of a text. If you give your students too large of a text, then they won't be able to read the entire thing closely enough to feel comfortable using it for support.

#### **Step 2: Let Students Prepare**

Socratic Seminars are based on critical thinking, and when students are put on the spot, they can't delve as deeply as they would like into a given topic. Give students, at the very least, 24 hours to prepare for a Socratic seminar.

#### **Step 3: Give Students Questions**

Give students a handout with questions at least one day in advance.

Give the students 4-6 questions. Assign 2-3 questions that are based closely on the text and that would be rather easy for the students to prove.

Have the students begin by sharing their answers to one or all of the first questions. They often feel more confident sharing their answers to these questions, and by building their confidence.

#### **Step 4: Set Up Inner and Outer Circles**

The basic format to a Socratic seminar is having students divided into two groups and sitting in two circles – an inner circle and an outer circle. The inner circle represents the speakers. These are the students who discuss the questions. The outer circle students are the recorders. These people silently record notes on the inner circle speakers. After a certain amount of time, both circles switch so that all students have had a chance being in each circle.

#### **Step 5: Don't Jump In**

Teachers love to explain things – it's why we're in this profession in the first place! When your students are discussing an issue, sometimes they miss an important detail or come to an illogical conclusion. Just let that happen. As hard as it may be to sit there and listen as they pass over an important symbol or fail

to question another classmate's self-contradiction, you have to remember that you are merely a facilitator. Your role is to (1) introduce new questions when the discussion starts to lag and (2) let students know when to wrap up their discussion. Your role is NOT to add your own thoughts – this is a mainly student-led method.

---

**Before you begin, remind students:**

- 1) Talk to each other, not just to the discussion leader or teacher.
- 2) Refer to evidence from the text to support your ideas.
- 3) Ask questions if you do not understand what someone has said, or you can paraphrase what another student has said for clarification. (“I think you said this, is that right?”)
- 4) You do not need to raise your hands to speak, but please pay attention to your “airtime” – how much you have spoken in relation to other students.
- 5) Don't interrupt.
- 6) Don't put down the ideas of another student. Without judging the student who you may disagree with, state your alternate interpretation or ask a follow-up question to help probe or clarify an idea.
- 7) Common statements or questions used during a Socratic seminar include:
  - a) What does this word or phrase mean?
  - b) Can you say that in another way?
  - c) Is this what you mean to say?
  - d) What do you think the author is trying to say?
  - e) What else could that mean?
  - f) Who was the audience for this text? How does that shape our interpretation of these words?
  - g) Who was the author of this text? What do we know about him/her? How does that shape our understanding of these words?

Before beginning the seminar it is also important to remind students that the purpose of the seminar is not to debate or prove a point, but to more deeply understand what the author was trying to express in the text. Also, if you have never done a Socratic seminar with your students before, you might spend a few moments brainstorming the qualities that would

make for a great seminar. These qualities or criteria can be placed on rubric and used to evaluate the seminar at the end of the class period. Criteria you might use to evaluate a Socratic seminar include: engagement (everyone listening and sharing), respect (no interruptions or put-downs), meaning-making (students understand the text more deeply at the end of the seminar), and use of evidence (comments always refer back to the text).

---

## **Suggested Seminar Questions for Lincoln's *House Divided***

Opening:

What is the most striking image or metaphor in the speech?

Core:

Look at the dash marks in the speech. What purpose do they serve?

How does Lincoln support his argument?

How does Lincoln use logos to support his argument?

Find examples of figurative language in the speech. How do they affect the tone? The effectiveness of the narrative?

Why is this speech significant?

Look at the scriptural references in the speech. What do such references tell us about Lincoln's argument on slavery?

Closing:

Can today's public be described as indifferent? What are the similarities and/or differences between the public of Lincoln's era and the public of today?

Are we more powerful united as one?

### Socratic Seminar Analytic Rubric

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Conduct</b>	Demonstrates respect for the learning process; has patience with different opinions and complexity; shows initiative by asking others for clarification: brings others into the conversation, moves the conversation forward; speaks to all of the participants; avoids talking too much.	Generally shows composure but may display impatience with contradictory or confusing ideas; comments, but does not necessarily encourage others to participate; may tend to address only the teacher or get into debates.	Participates and expresses a belief that his/her ideas are important in understanding the text; may make insightful comments but is either too forceful or too shy and does not contribute to the progress of the conversation; tends to debate, not dialogue.	Displays little respect for the learning process; argumentative; takes advantage of minor distractions; uses inappropriate language; speaks to individuals rather than ideas; arrives unprepared without notes, pencil/pen or perhaps even without the text.
<b>Speaking &amp; Reasoning</b>	Understands question before answering; cites evidence from text; expresses thoughts in complete sentences; moves conversation forward; makes connections between ideas; resolves apparent contradictory ideas; considers others' viewpoints, not only his/her own; avoids bad logic.	Responds to questions voluntarily; comments show an appreciation for the text but not an appreciation for the subtler points within it; comments are logical but not connected to other speakers; ideas interesting enough that others respond to them.	Responds to questions but may have to be called upon by others; has read the text but not put much effort into preparing questions and ideas for the seminar; comments take details into account but may not flow logically in conversation.	Extremely reluctant to participate even when called upon; comments illogical and meaningless; may mumble or express incomplete ideas; little or no account taken of previous comments or important ideas in the text.



<b>Listening</b>	<p>Pays attention to details; writes down questions; responses take into account all participants; demonstrates that he/she has kept up; points out faulty logic respectfully; overcomes distractions.</p>	<p>Generally pays attention and responds thoughtfully to ideas and questions of other participants and the leader; absorption in own ideas may distract the participant from the ideas of others.</p>	<p>Appears to find some ideas unimportant while responding to others; may have to have questions or confusions repeated due to inattention; takes few notes during the seminar in response to ideas and comments.</p>	<p>Appears uninvolved in the seminar; comments display complete misinterpretation of questions or comments of other participants.</p>
<b>Reading</b>	<p>Thoroughly familiar with the text; has notations and questions in the margins; key words, phrases, and ideas are highlighted; possible contradictions identified; pronounces words correctly.</p>	<p>Has read the text and comes with some ideas from it but these may not be written out in advance; good understanding of the vocabulary but may mispronounce some new or foreign words.</p>	<p>Appears to have read or skimmed the text but has not marked the text or made meaningful notes or questions; shows difficulty with vocabulary; mispronounces important words; key concepts misunderstood; little evidence of serious reflection prior to the seminar.</p>	<p>Student is unprepared for the seminar; important words, phrases, ideas in the text are unfamiliar; no notes or questions marked in the text; no attempt made to get help with difficult material.</p>

(Adapted with permission from Paul Raider)

## Argument Writing Rubric

**Purpose and Forms:** “Arguments are used for many purposes—to change the reader’s point of view, to bring about some action on the reader’s part, or to ask the reader to accept the writer’s explanation or evaluation of a concept, issue, or problem. An argument is a reasoned, logical way of demonstrating that the writer’s position, belief, or conclusion is valid.”

Argument	Advanced 4 90-100	Proficient 3 70-89	Basic 2 60-69	Below Basic 1 50-59
<b>Ideas/Purpose:</b> The argument is focused and clearly states the claim(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claim(s) is clearly stated and distinguished from alternate or opposing claims</li> <li>Claim(s) is purposefully focused and consistent</li> <li>Complex claims are well-developed</li> <li>Alternate or opposing claims are thoroughly addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claim(s) is clearly stated and distinguished from alternate or opposing claims</li> <li>Claim(s) is focused and consistent</li> <li>Alternate or opposing claims are addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claim(s) is sometimes clear, focused or consistent</li> <li>Alternate or opposing claims are sometimes addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claim(s) is unclear, unfocused, inconsistent or missing</li> <li>Alternate or opposing claims are not addressed or missing</li> </ul>
<b>Organization:</b> The writing has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness.	Claims, reasons, and evidence are organized into clear categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skillful and varied use of transitions</li> <li>Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>Purposeful introduction and conclusion</li> <li>Strong connections among ideas</li> </ul>	Claims, reasons, and evidence are organized into clear categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate use of transitions with some variety</li> <li>Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>Evident introduction and conclusion</li> </ul>	Claims, reasons, and evidence are inconsistently organized into categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some use of transitions</li> <li>Inadequate progression of ideas from beginning to end</li> <li>Ineffective introduction and conclusion</li> </ul>	Claims, reasons, and evidence are inconsistently organized into categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no use of transitions</li> <li>Confusing progression of ideas</li> <li>Missing introduction and/or conclusion</li> <li>No connections among ideas</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate connections among ideas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak connections among ideas</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Elaboration of Evidence:</b></p> <p>The claim is developed and supported with logical reasoning and relevant evidence using accurate, credible sources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides comprehensive support/evidence for the claim(s) , demonstrating a thorough understanding of the topic or text</li> <li>• Presents well-chosen evidence (sources, facts, and details)</li> <li>• Skillfully integrates evidence with correct citations</li> <li>• Analyzes and draws strong conclusions from evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides adequate support/evidence for the claim(s), demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text</li> <li>• Uses relevant, logical evidence (sources, facts, and details)</li> <li>• Integrates evidence from sources with generally correct citations</li> <li>• Analyzes and draws logical conclusions from evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides inadequate support/evidence for the claim(s) , demonstrating a partial understanding of the topic or text</li> <li>• Uses some irrelevant, repetitive, or inadequate evidence (sources, facts, and details)</li> <li>• Limited integration of evidence from sources with some attempt at citations</li> <li>• Inconsistently analyzes evidence</li> <li>• Conclusions drawn are sometimes not logical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides little or no support/evidence for the claim(s) , demonstrating a lack of understanding of the topic or text</li> <li>• Frequently uses irrelevant, repetitive, or inadequate evidence (sources, facts, and details)</li> <li>• Does not integrate evidence from sources or lacks citations</li> <li>• Fails to analyze evidence</li> <li>• Conclusions drawn are not logical or are missing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Language and Vocabulary:</b></p> <p>The writing uses precise and topic-specific language and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses precise, academic language</li> <li>• Use of topic-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a mix of precise with more general language</li> <li>• Use of topic-specific vocabulary is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses simplistic language</li> <li>• Inconsistent use of topic-specific vocabulary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses limited or vague language</li> <li>• Lacks topic-specific vocabulary</li> <li>• Lack of formal/ appropriate style</li> </ul>

<p>maintains a formal/ appropriate style.</p>	<p>for the audience and purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishes and consistently maintains a formal/ appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishes and generally maintains a formal/ appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacks a consistent formal/ appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>shows little sense of audience and purposes</p>
<p><b>Conventions:</b> The writing demonstrates a command of conventions and assigned format.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal errors/patterns of error in usage, sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and format</li> <li>Skillful use of sentence structure enhances meaning</li> </ul>	<p>Minimal errors/patterns of error in usage, sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and format</p>	<p>Frequent errors/patterns of error in usage, sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and format</p>	<p>Severe errors/patterns of error in usage, sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and format interfere with understanding</p>

**0=no evidence/missing**



[meteoreducation.com](http://meteoreducation.com) . 800.699.7516

MeTEOR CONNECT, MeTEOR Education and MeTEOR Design are trademarks or registered trademarks of MeTEOR Education, LLC © 2019.

All rights reserved. PTELA.ENGI.3