**Op-Ed Rubric**

| Categories & Criteria | Advanced Understanding | Proficient Understanding | Emerging Understanding | Beginning Understanding |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead | Written with an outstanding lead to bring the reader into the story. |  |  |  |
| Issue/Background | Contains an abundant amount of background information about the issue (who, what, when, where, why, how). | Contains some background information about the issue. | Contains very little information about the background information. | Contains confusing and irrelevant background information (or none at all). |
| Opinion | Has a clearly stated opinion toward the beginning of the article which continues throughout. | Has an opinion that could be stated more clearly using better wording. | Has an opinion but it is somewhat confusing. | Writer is very confused about his/her opinion on the issue or no opinion is present. |
| Knowledge/Support for Opinion | Writing contains at least 2 outstanding, distinct, logical reasons for the stated opinion. Factual support or knowledge of issue is clearly evident. | Writing contains at least 2 reasons for stated opinion (distinct and logical reasons but not obvious). | Writing contains only one valid reason for opinion given. | Writing does not contain any valid reasons for the given opinion. |
| Audience | All the reasons are written to convince the appropriate audience. Purpose has been achieved. | Some of the writing would concern or appeal to the intended audience. At times, the focus wanders from the intended audience. | Very little of the article contains reasons that would concern or appeal to the intended audience. | None of the article contains arguments and/or reasons that address the intended |
| Use of academic language to inform the audience | Writing contains many vivid examples of academic language that supports the opinion of the Op-Ed. Evidence of logical/emotional language and action words. | Writing contains some vivid examples of academic language that support the opinion of the Op-Ed. Some evidence of logical/emotional language and actions. . | Attempts to use some vivid examples of academic language that supports the opinion of the Op-Ed. Very little evidence of logical/emotional language, and action words. | Very little evidence of examples of academic language that supports the opinion of the Op-Ed or use of logical/emotional language, and action words. |
| Transitions | The writer uses effective words throughout the article to make transitions between ideas. | Some of the transitions are weaker, detracting from the writing and organization. | Some sections are too isolated – not linked by transitions. | Writing lacks transitions, leading to a disjointed and confusing reading. |
| Solutions/Recommendations/Conclusions | Ends the article giving very specific and outstanding conclusions for the reader to take action. Reader feels compelled to act. | Ends the article giving specific – albeit conventional and obvious – conclusions for the reader. | Ends the article giving at least one ordinary conclusion for the reader. | Ends the article without any clear conclusion for the reader to take action. Concludes too abruptly. |
| Grammar and Spelling | Uses all correct grammar and spelling throughout. Sentence variety and word choices are outstanding. | Uses mostly correct grammar and spelling. Some attempt at variety in words | Several grammar and spelling mistakes. Words choices are simple; sentences lack variety. | Many grammar and spelling mistakes. Word choices are weak and sentence variety is nonexistent. |