|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Score** |
|  | **4** | **3** | **2** |
| **Accuracy of claim** | Makes a scientifically correct claim and completely catches the substance of the investigation. | Makes a scientifically correct claim and partially catches the substance of the investigation. | Makes a scientifically incorrect claim. |
| **Sufficiency of evidence** | Provides more than two pieces of evidence and makes a rebuttal. | Provides two pieces of evidence. | Provides one piece of evidence. |
| **Quality of evidence** | Makes a competent explanation completely based on interpretation of investigation data. | Makes a competent explanation partially based on interpretation of investigation data. | Makes a competent explanation or reports data as evidence. |
| **The relationship between claim and evidence** | Makes a strong and smooth connection between claim and evidence.  **Uses at least one crosscutting concept.** | Makes a strong connection between claim and evidence. | Makes a weak connection between claim and evidence. |
| **Presents a rebuttal to another claim** | Rebuttal is coherent and provides appropriate evidence and explanation for disagreement. | Rebuttal is somewhat incomplete with explanation only partially based on evidence. | Makes a weak rebuttal with incomplete explanation not based on evidence. |
| **Multimode representation** | Uses more than one mode (text) in explaining the concept(s) and it is tied to the text. | Uses more than one mode (text) in explaining the concept(s) but does so separately from text. | Only uses one mode (text) to explain the concept in writing. |
| **Audience language** | Language is appropriate, easy to understand, and meets the demands of the audience. | Although clearly aware of audience, the writer only occasionally speaks directly to that audience. | Does not consider the audience’s language. |
| **Score** |  |

**Rubric**