## Wetlands Ideas and Content 6-point Rubric (page 1)

6	5	4
The writing is	The writing is clear,	The writing is clear and
exceptionally clear,	focused, and interesting. It	focused. The reader can
focused and interesting. It	holds the reader's	easily understand the main
holds the reader's attention	attention. Main ideas stand	ideas. Support is present,
throughout. Main ideas	out and are developed by	although it may be limited
stand out and are	supporting details suitable	or rather general. The
developed by strong	to audience and purpose.	writing is characterized by:
support and contain rich	The writing is	✤ An easily identifiable
details suitable to audience	characteristized by:	purpose
and purpose. The writing is	<ul><li>Clarity, focus, and</li></ul>	<ul><li>Clear main idea(s)</li></ul>
characterized by:	control	<ul> <li>Supporting details that</li> </ul>
<ul><li>✤ Clarity, focus, and</li></ul>	<ul><li>Main idea(s) that stand</li></ul>	are relevant, but may
control	out	be overly general or
✤ Main idea(s) that stand	<ul> <li>Supporting, relevant,</li> </ul>	limited in places; when
out	carefully selected	appropriate, resources
Supporting, relevant,	details; when	are used to provide
carefully selected	appropriate, use of	accurate support
details; when	resources provides	<ul> <li>Content and selected</li> </ul>
appropriate use of	strong, accurate,	details that are relevant,
resources provides	credible support	but perhaps not
strong, accurate,	<ul> <li>Content and selected</li> </ul>	consistently well
credible support	details that are well-	chosen for audience
<ul> <li>Content and selected</li> </ul>	suited to audience and	and purpose
details that are well	purpose	<ul><li>✤ 6 ways people have</li></ul>
suited to audience and	✤ 7 ways people have	affected the wetlands
purpose	affected the wetlands	4  ways to save the
✤ 8 ways people have	• 5 ways to save the	wetlands
affected the wetlands	wetlands	
$\bullet$ 6 ways to save the		
wetlands		



## Wetlands Ideas and Content 6-point Rubric (page 2)

<ul> <li>The reader can understand the main ideas, although they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but development attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic.</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic.</li> <li>The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic.</li> </ul>			1
<ul> <li>the main ideas, although they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but development al details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic</li> <li>the main ideas, although they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the characterized by:</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but development al details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic</li> <li>the main ideas, although they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the characterized by:</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>★ A ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	3	2	
<ul> <li>they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s) that may require extensive inferences by the reader</li> <li>★ Minimal development; insufficient details</li> <li>★ Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but development adetails that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic</li> <li>they may be overly broad development is attempted but minimal. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>★ A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Minimal development; insufficient details that clutter the text</li> <li>★ Extensive repetition</li> <li>★ 4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>		1 1	e
<ul> <li>or simplistic, and the results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>A n easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> </ul>	the main ideas, although	somewhat unclear or	
<ul> <li>results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>the reader</li> <li>Minimal development; insufficient details that clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>Yaways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	they may be overly broad	development is attempted	writing is characterized by:
<ul> <li>effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>A purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>A purpose and main idea(s) that may require extensive inferences by the reader</li> <li>Minimal development; insufficient details</li> <li>Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	or simplistic, and the	but minimal. The writing is	✤ Ideas that are extremely
<ul> <li>is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>Attempts at development that are minimal or nonexistent; the paper is too short to demonstrate the development of an idea</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>Attempts at development; insufficient details</li> <li>Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	results may not be	characterized by:	limited or simply
<ul> <li>insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>★ An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but developmental details</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	effective. Supporting detail	✤ A purpose and main	unclear
<ul> <li>general, or occasionally off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>★ An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>★ Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>the reader</li> <li>Minimal development; insufficient details</li> <li>★ Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>★ Extensive repetition</li> <li>★ 4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>★ 1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	is often limited,	idea(s) that may require	✤ Attempts at
<ul> <li>off-topic. The writing is characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>Minimal development; insufficient details</li> <li>Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	insubstantial, overly	extensive inferences by	development that are
<ul> <li>characterized by:</li> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>insufficient details</li> <li>Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	general, or occasionally	the reader	minimal or nonexistent;
<ul> <li>An easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>Irrelevant details that clutter the text</li> <li>Irrelevant details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> </ul>	off-topic. The writing is	<ul> <li>Minimal development;</li> </ul>	the paper is too short to
<ul> <li>purpose and main idea(s)</li> <li>Support that is attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic</li> <li>clutter the text</li> <li>Extensive repetition</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	characterized by:	insufficient details	demonstrate the
<ul> <li>idea(s)</li> <li>★ Extensive repetition</li> <li>★ Extensive repetition</li> <li>★ 4 ways people have attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic</li> <li>★ Extensive repetition</li> <li>★ 4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>★ 2 ways to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	✤ An easily identifiable	<ul> <li>Irrelevant details that</li> </ul>	development of an idea
<ul> <li>Support that is attempted; but affected the wetlands</li> <li>developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off-topic</li> <li>4 ways people have affected the wetlands</li> <li>2 ways to save the wetlands</li> <li>1 way to save the wetlands</li> </ul>	purpose and main	clutter the text	✤ 3 ways people have
attempted; but developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic	idea(s)	<ul> <li>Extensive repetition</li> </ul>	affected the wetlands
developmental details that are limited in scope or somewhat off- topic	✤ Support that is	✤ 4 ways people have	✤ 1 way to save the
that are limited in wetlands scope or somewhat off- topic	attempted; but	affected the wetlands	wetlands
that are limited in wetlands scope or somewhat off- topic	developmental details	$\checkmark$ 2 ways to save the	
topic	that are limited in		
1	scope or somewhat off-		
1	topic		
	<ul> <li>Difficulties when</li> </ul>		
moving from general	moving from general		
observations to			
specifics	specifics		
✤ 5 ways people have	1		
affected the wetlands			
✤ 3 ways to save the			
wetlands	5		

