|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gabriela Cowperthwaite creates a convincing argument in her film, *Blackfish*. Defend, Refute, or qualify this position based on your rhetorical analysis of the film and of SeaWorld’s rebuttal.**  **(include lesson vocabulary such as: concession, rebuttal, counterargument, ethos, logos, pathos)** | | | |
| **Name** | **Performance level 2** | **Performance Level 1** | **Performance level 0** |
| Evaluation of Author’s argument (RI 3) | Student completely articulated a defensible opinion based on source information. | Student identifies an opinion, but it may be incompletely articulated or not completely defensible. | The student did not identify an opinion or identified an indefensible interpretation. |
| Use of Ethos (RI 4, 6) | Student adequately explains how and why the author created ethos to establish the argument. | Student addresses ethos, but might generalize how the author created it to establish the argument. The student generalizes why ethos helps the argument. | Student does not explain how and/or why the author establishes ethos to enhance the argument. |
| Use of Pathos (RI 4, 6) | Student adequately explains how and why the author uses pathos to enhance the argument. | Student addresses pathos, but might generalize how and why it is used to enhance the argument. | Student identifies pathos and/or does not explain how pathos is used to enhance the argument OR student incorrectly identifies pathos. |
| Argument Validity  (RI 8) | Student adequately explains how the author met the criteria for a valid argument by examining possible logical fallacies and also connects the validity to the student’s opinion. | Student explains how the author does or does not have a valid argument based on possible logical fallacies, but doesn’t fully connect the validity of specific examples to the student’s conclusion. | The student does not indicate an understanding of how to evaluate the text for logical fallacies or how the text’s content validity connects to the student’s conclusion. |
| Quality of Details  (RI 1) | The student selected the appropriate amount of the **best** details for supporting their conclusion and discussion of the use of ethos, pathos, and logos. | The student selected some details but they were not fully adequate for supporting their conclusion and discussion of the use of ethos, pathos, and logos. | The student selected no details, very generalized details, or irrelevant details |
| Writing Quality  (W 2) | Response is coherently written with few or no errors in standard English. Response organization is effective. Effective transitions are used. | Response is written with limited errors in standard English conventions. Response may not be effectively organized or coherent, but is focused on one central idea | Response is poorly crafted with many errors in standard English conventions. Comprehension is limited due to errors.  Basic errors in pronoun use, capitalization, punctuation, or sentence structure occur. |