|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *“Blackfish* presents a convincing argument that SeaWorld needs to change and that life for the orcas at SeaWorld is harmful.”  Do you agree or disagree with this statement. Write an essay examining how Gabriela Cowperthwaite does or does not create her argument.  **(include lesson vocabulary such as: rebuttal, 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. |