

**ACADEMIC LITERACY SKILLS TEST (ALST) RUBRIC FOR EXTENDED-RESPONSE ITEM**

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	<b>The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "2" response demonstrates limited argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "1" response demonstrates a lack of argumentative writing skills.</b>
<b>CONTENT AND ANALYSIS: the extent to which the response conveys complex ideas and information clearly and accurately in order to support claims in an analysis of topics and sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall argumentation follows logically from the source material and is appropriate to task and audience.</li> <li>The response contains a claim that establishes a clear, compelling, defensible position on the issue.</li> <li>Its claim demonstrates insightful comprehension of source material and valid, precise reasoning.</li> <li>One or more opposing position or counterclaim is clearly stated and refuted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall argumentation follows generally from the source material and is relevant to task and audience.</li> <li>The response contains a claim that establishes a generally clear, defensible position on the issue.</li> <li>Its claim demonstrates sufficient comprehension of source material and valid basic reasoning.</li> <li>One or more opposing position or counterclaim is recognized and generally addressed and refuted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major points of argumentation are missing or irrelevant to the task.</li> <li>The response contains a claim but does not establish a clear position.</li> <li>Its claim demonstrates basic literal comprehension of source material but with significant misinterpretation.</li> <li>Opposing positions and counterclaims may not be addressed or refuted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little or no argumentation, serving no clear purpose.</li> <li>The response contains a minimal idea but fails to present a claim beyond literal repetition of task or source material. No overarching position is established.</li> <li>Its claim is irrelevant, unconnected to topic and source material, or demonstrates no comprehension of source material or task.</li> <li>Opposing positions and counterclaims are neither addressed nor refuted.</li> </ul>

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	<b>The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "2" response demonstrates limited argumentative writing skills.</b>	<b>The "1" response demonstrates a lack of argumentative writing skills.</b>
<b>COMMAND OF EVIDENCE: the extent to which the response presents evidence from the provided sources to support analysis and synthesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence represents an accurate synthesis and analysis of information from all sources.</li> <li>• The claim is well supported with relevant, well-chosen facts, definitions, details, quotations, and/or other information from the sources.</li> <li>• Use of relevant, varied, and accurate evidence is sustained throughout the entire argument.</li> <li>• The core reasoning of the argument is consistently valid, follows insightfully from the evidence, and extends beyond ideas in the sources.</li> <li>• Sources are consistently and correctly cited, avoiding plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence represents a generally accurate synthesis and analysis of information from the sources.</li> <li>• The claim is generally supported with relevant facts, definitions, details, quotations, and/or other information from the sources.</li> <li>• Use of relevant, varied, and accurate evidence is generally sustained.</li> <li>• The core reasoning of the argument is generally valid and follows from the evidence, but may not extend beyond ideas in the sources.</li> <li>• Sources are generally cited, and plagiarism is generally avoided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence represents a partially accurate synthesis and analysis of information and may be drawn from only one source.</li> <li>• The claim is partially supported with some relevant facts, definitions, details, quotations, and/or other information from the sources.</li> <li>• Use of relevant, varied, and accurate evidence is partially sustained.</li> <li>• The core reasoning of the argument is flawed and tangential with respect to the evidence.</li> <li>• Sources may not be cited, and some plagiarism may be present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If evidence is present, it represents little or no accurate synthesis and analysis of information from the sources.</li> <li>• The claim is minimally supported with few or no facts, definitions, details, quotations, and/or other information from the sources.</li> <li>• Use of evidence is not sustained. What is provided is irrelevant.</li> <li>• The core reasoning of the argument is not valid.</li> <li>• Sources are not cited and significant plagiarism is present.</li> </ul>

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of argumentative writing skills.	The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of argumentative writing skills.	The "2" response demonstrates limited argumentative writing skills.	The "1" response demonstrates a lack of argumentative writing skills.
<b>COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, and STYLE:</b> <b>the extent to which the response logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The organizational strategies are especially effective for the nature of the argumentation, content, and purpose.</li> <li>The introduction clearly establishes a context for argument, as well as interest and relevance; the conclusion effectively supports the information presented and provides a sense of resolution.</li> <li>The argument progresses logically and smoothly from paragraph to paragraph. The skillful use of appropriate and varied transitions enhances coherence and meaning.</li> <li>Successful and consistent stylistic choices enhance persuasiveness.</li> <li>The response consistently uses appropriate, stylistically sophisticated language and precise and domain-specific vocabulary, with a notable sense of voice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The organizational strategies are generally effective for the nature of the argumentation, content, and purpose.</li> <li>The introduction generally establishes a context for argument, as well as relevance; the conclusion generally supports the information presented and restates the claim.</li> <li>The argument progresses logically from paragraph to paragraph. The use of appropriate transitions generally promotes coherence and meaning.</li> <li>Stylistic choices generally aid persuasiveness.</li> <li>The response generally uses appropriate language and some precise and domain-specific vocabulary, with an appropriate sense of voice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The organizational strategies are partially effective for the nature of the argumentation, content, and purpose.</li> <li>The introduction and conclusion, if present, are statements of literal ideas that do not establish context.</li> <li>The argument progresses from paragraph to paragraph, but the limited use of appropriate transitions undermines coherence and meaning.</li> <li>Stylistic choices are limited and only partially aid persuasiveness.</li> <li>The response uses language that may be inappropriate at times. Vocabulary may be imprecise, repetitive, or incorrectly used, and domain-specific vocabulary may be misused or absent. A sense of voice may be inconsistent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizational strategies are not effective.</li> <li>Introduction and conclusion are rudimentary or are not present.</li> <li>The response contains discrete paragraphs, but the relationships among them is unclear. A sense of progression and coherence is absent. A lack of organization within paragraphs impedes meaning.</li> <li>There is little or no evidence of stylistic choice.</li> <li>The response uses language that is inappropriate. Vocabulary is often incorrect, and domain-specific vocabulary is absent.</li> </ul>

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of argumentative writing skills.	The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of argumentative writing skills.	The "2" response demonstrates limited argumentative writing skills.	The "1" response demonstrates a lack of argumentative writing skills.
<b>CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS: the extent to which the response demonstrates command of the conventions of standard written English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response illustrates consistent command of standard writing conventions (capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and spelling).</li> <li>Sentence structure is clear, varied, and effective.</li> <li>Errors, when present, do not disrupt understanding or the force of the writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response illustrates general command of standard writing conventions (capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and spelling).</li> <li>Sentence structure is generally clear, varied, and effective.</li> <li>Errors do not disrupt understanding, but may reduce the force of the writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response includes partial command of standard writing conventions (capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and spelling). Some errors may be significant.</li> <li>Sentence structure is only partially effective. Sentences are sometimes unclear, repetitive, simplistic or incorrect.</li> <li>Errors sometimes disrupt understanding and undermine the force of the writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response illustrates little or no command of standard writing conventions (capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and spelling).</li> <li>Sentence structure is ineffective. Sentences are often unclear, repetitive, simplistic or incorrect.</li> <li>Errors often disrupt understanding.</li> </ul>
<b>UNSCORABLE</b>	The response is unscorable because it is unrelated to the assigned topic or off-task, unreadable, written in a language other than English or contains an insufficient amount of original work to score.			
<b>BLANK</b>	No response.			

## ACADEMIC LITERACY SKILLS TEST (ALST) RUBRIC FOR FOCUSED-RESPONSE ITEMS

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	<b>The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of relevant skills.</b>	<b>The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of relevant skills.</b>	<b>The "2" response demonstrates limited relevant skills.</b>	<b>The "1" response demonstrates a lack of relevant skills.</b>
<b>CONTENT: the extent to which the response meets the requirements of the assignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates strong understanding of the assignment and clearly and completely addresses all requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates satisfactory understanding of the assignment and addresses all requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates limited understanding of the assignment; some requirements are not addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates little or no understanding of the assignment and may not address requirements.</li> </ul>
<b>ANALYSIS, EVALUATION, AND INTEGRATION: the extent to which the response demonstrates understanding of and engagement with the provided sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates accurate and insightful delineation, analysis, and evaluation of the relevant sources.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate and insightful comparison and integration of information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates generally accurate delineation, analysis, and evaluation of the relevant sources.</li> <li>The response demonstrates generally accurate comparison and integration of information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates limited accuracy and some attempt at delineation, analysis, and evaluation of sources.</li> <li>The response demonstrates partially accurate comparison and integration of information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates little or no accuracy or no delineation, analysis, or evaluation of sources.</li> <li>The assignment demonstrates little or no comparison or integration of information.</li> </ul>
<b>COMMAND OF EVIDENCE: the extent to which the response presents evidence from the provided sources to support analysis, evaluation, and integration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is well-supported by relevant facts, details, examples, and/or quotations from the sources.</li> <li>Reasoning is consistently valid.</li> <li>Sources are consistently and correctly cited, avoiding plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is generally supported by some facts, details, examples, and/or quotations from the sources.</li> <li>Reasoning is generally valid.</li> <li>Sources are generally cited, and plagiarism is generally avoided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is only partially supported by limited references to the sources.</li> <li>Reasoning is partially valid.</li> <li>Sources may not be cited, and some plagiarism may be present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response includes little or no supporting evidence from the sources, and may include un-sourced information.</li> <li>Reasoning is not valid.</li> <li>Sources are not cited and significant plagiarism is present.</li> </ul>

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	The "4" response demonstrates a strong command of relevant skills.	The "3" response demonstrates a satisfactory command of relevant skills.	The "2" response demonstrates limited relevant skills.	The "1" response demonstrates a lack of relevant skills.
COHERENCE AND CLARITY: the extent to which the response is focused and clear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is clearly and consistently focused on the assignment.</li> <li>Errors in conventions do not disrupt understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is generally focused on the assignment, with little irrelevant material.</li> <li>Errors in conventions may cause minor disruptions in understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is partially focused on the assignment, but irrelevant material is included.</li> <li>Errors in conventions disrupt understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is not focused and may be irrelevant to the assignment.</li> <li>Errors in conventions may significantly disrupt meaning.</li> </ul>
UNSCORABLE	The response is unscorable because it is unrelated to the assigned topic or off-task, unreadable, written in a language other than English or contains an insufficient amount of original work to score.			
BLANK	No response.			