Argument-Centered Curriculum Component	1 Learning	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Expert
Understanding of the Language and Concepts of Academic Argumentation	* Sparse use of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Often or occasionally inconsistent or inaccurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Partial, sporadic use of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Mostly consistent, mostly accurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Regular use of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Consistent and highly accurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Extensive and thoroughly adapted use of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Consistent, accurate, and insightful use of argumentation language and concepts
Identification and Formulation of Issues and Controversies	* No use of debatable issues or controversies to organize curricular units or projects * Debatable issues highly flawed, when used -- not open, balanced, focused, authentic, or of intellectual interest	* Partial, sporadic use of debatable issues or controversies to organize curricular units or projects * Debatable issues partially flawed, when used -- partially open, balanced, focused, authentic, and of intellectual interest	* Regular, consistent use of debatable issues or controversies to organize curricular units or projects * Debatable issues consistently meet the criteria for effectiveness: open, balanced, focused, authentic, and of intellectual interest	* Regular (or especially adept) use of interesting, original, or important debatable issues or controversies * Debatable issues excel in all of the criteria for effectiveness: open, balanced, focused, authentic, and of intellectual interest
Creative and Differentiated Application of Argumentation in the Curriculum	* No creativity or originality in the application of argumentation in the curriculum * No differentiation for various learners in the application of argumentation to the curriculum * Full dependence on external sources for argument-centered curriculum	* Partial, limited creativity or originality in the application of argumentation in the curriculum * Partial, limited attempts to differentiate the application of argumentation * Signficant dependence on external sources for argument-centered curriculum	* Some real creativity and originality in the application of argumentation in the curriculum * Substantive, regular attempts to differentiate the application of argumentation * Some use of external sources for argument-centered curriculum, blended with created argument-centered resources	* Distinctly creative, original application of argumentation in the curriculum * Expert, nuanced, effective differentiation of argumentation * Assimilation of external sources for argument-centered curriculum within a self-designed curriculum
Coherence and Integration Around Argumentation	* Lack of coherence and integration around argumentation * Disjointed, disconnected, or stand-alone use of argumentation within units or projects	* Some, limited integration, and partial coherence, around argumentation * Units or projects are partially inter-connected by argumentation	* Consistent basic coherence and integration around argumentation * Units or projects are basically inter-connected by argumentation	* Structurally elegant, insightful, or especially effective coherence and integration around argumentation * Units or projects are efficently inter-connected by argumentation
Establishment of Objectives and Activities to Attain Observable or Measurable Student Growth	* No establishment of argument-related objectives, or no follow-through on objectives * No, or ineffective, activities put in place to attain student growth on argument-based objectives	* Partial, inconsistent, or partly-clear establishment of argument-related objectives * Partial, somewhat effective activities put in place to attain student growth on argument-based objectives	* Regular, consistent, appropriate establishment of argument-related objectives * Effective, substantive activities put in place to attain student growth on argument-based objectives	* Insightful, well-sequenced establishment of argument-related objectives * Especially effective, specfically-tailored activities, with prompt feedback, put in place to attain student growth on argument-based objectives
Effective Use of Formative and Summative Argument-Based Assessment	* No, or very scant, use of formative and summative argument-based assessment * Formative and summative argument-based assessment used lacks validity and utlitiy	* Some use of either formative or summative argument-based assessment * Formative or summative assessment has partial validity or utility	* Consistent, appropriate use of formative and summative argument-based assessment * Formative and summative assessments have validity and utility	* Especially insightful, well-designed formative and summative argument-based assessment * Consistent and highly effective implementation * Formative and summative assessments have validity, and they help drive student performance and achievement gains

Argument-Centered Instruction Component	1 Learning	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Expert
Application of the Language and Concepts of Academic Argumentation	* Sparse use in the classroom of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Often or occasionally inconsistent or inaccurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Partial, sporadic use in the classroom of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Mostly consistent, mostly accurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Regular use in the classroom of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Consistent and highly accurate use of argumentation language and concepts	* Extensive and thoroughly adapted use in the classroom of the language and concepts of academic argumentation * Consistent, accurate, and insightful use of argumentation language and concepts
Implementation of a Rigorous Standard of Evidence	* Classroom implementation of argument-centered instruction lacks a rigorous standard of evidence * Opportunities consistently missed to push students to produce evidence that is more closely aligned with their claims, more credible, or more sufficient	* Classroom implementation has an inconsistenly applied, or partially rigorous, standard of evidence * Some opportunities missed to push students to produce evidence that is more closely aligned with their claims, more credible, or more sufficient	* Consistent, regular application of a rigorous standard of evidence in the classroom * Almost all opportunities taken advantage of to push students to produce evidence that is closely aligned with their claims, highly credible, and sufficient	* Especially thorough application of a rigorous standard of evidence, often resulting in evidence that is analyzed or debated closely * Pervasive, accepted standard of evidence throughout the class to produce evidence that is closely aligned with claims, highly credible, and sufficient
Implementation of a Rigorous Standard of Refutation and Critical Thinking	* Classroom implementation of argument-centered instruction lacks a rigorous standard of refutation * Opportunities consistently missed to push students to produce refutation that is more responsive, more comprehensive, and exhibits more depth of thinking	* Classroom implementation has an inconsistenly applied, or partially rigorous, standard of refutation * Some opportunities missed to push students to produce refutation that is responsive, comprehensive, and reflective of deep critical thinking	* Consistent, regular application of a rigorous standard of refutation in the classroom * Frequent and appropriate instances during classroom instruction of refutation and critical thinking that is responsive, comprehensive, and deep	* Especially thorough application of a rigorous standard of refutation throughout classroom instruction * Pervasive, accepted standard of refutation throughout the classroom, that leads to student-initiated, rigorous instances of refutaiton and critical thinking
Use of Argument-Centered Questioning and Discussion Techniques	* Little to no use of argument-centered questioning and discussion techniques * Questions posed by the teacher do not require that students make arguments * Little to no reflective, text-based discussion is generated	* Some, partially effective use of argument-centered questioning & discussion techniques * Students may not be aware that they are being asked to make or engage with arguments * Partial student participation; discussion may be either teacher-dominated or dominated by a few students	* Effective use of argument-centered questioning and discussion techniques * Teacher asks a blend of higher- and lower-order thinking questions * Most or almost all students participate; some discussion and argumentation occurs between students; almost all discussion is substantive and argument-based	* Argument-centered questioning and discussion techniques consistently push student thinking * Student-generated questions or discussion leadership is important * Almost all students participate in a highly student-centered discussion structure; insights are created or articulated by students, and there is robust engagement between students
Effective Management of Argument-Centered Projects and Activities	* Ineffective management of argument-centered projects and activities * Pacing of argument-centered activities is deficient * Students are often unengaged and inactive * Students are frequently unsure of directions and tasks	* Partially effective management of argument-centered projects and activities * Pacing of argument-centered activities is imprecise (either bogged down or rushed) * Students are occasionally unengaged or inactive * Students can mostly follow the directions and task descriptions	* Effective management of argument-centered projects and activities * Pacing of argument-centered activities is appropriate * Almost all students are consistently engaged or active, reflecting some differentiation * Directions and task descriptions are well understood	* Fluid, unobtrusive, and highly effective management of argument-centered projects and activities * Implementation flexibly conforms to student response and is appropriately differentiated * Almost all students are highly engaged and active
Feedback to Students on Their Argumentation	* Little to no feedback given to students on their argumentation * Feedback that is given is often not timely, not specific, or not apt	* Partial, occasional feedback given to students on their argumentation * Feedback is sometimes timely, partially specific, and occasionally apt	* Regular, consistent feedback given to students on their argumentation * Feedback is almost always timely, specific, and apt	* Rigorously frequent, sometimes real-time feedback given to students on their argumentation * Feedback insightful, specific, connected to consistent criteria, and contributive to student performance gains *Effective feedback provided both to individuals and to whole classes

Argument-Centered Culture Component	1 Learning	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Expert
Assimilation of the Norms, Practices, and Terms of Academic Argument	* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are unfamiliar or alien to students * Numerous students demonstrate mistaken understanding of argument norms or terms * Students generally uncomfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation	* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are partially familiar to most students * Students generally demonstrate a limited understanding of argument norms and terms * Students somewhat comfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation	* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are familiar to most students * Students generally demonstrate a solid understanding of argument norms and terms * Students are comfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation, and they apply them appropriately	* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are thoroughly familiar to, and have been assimilated by, almost all students * Students demonstrate an advanced understanding of argument norms or terms * Students are able to "see through the lens" of argument to get to advanced content and ideas
Student Engagement with Other Students	* Very little to no student engagement with other students * No understanding of argument constructs or stems	* Occasional, limited student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments * Partial understanding and ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems * Students rarely or infrequently engage other students when not explicitly prodded to	* Frequent student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments * Most students demonstrate the ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems * Students sometimes engage other students even when not explicitly prodded to do so	* Student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments common and sometimes highly insightful * Almost all students demonstrate the ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems * Students frequently engage other students even when not explicitly prodded to do so
Originality and Independence of Student Thinking	* Very little to no originality and independence of student thinking * Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are often closely replicated by students * Argument claims and evidence all highly predictable	* Some limited originality and independence of student thinking * Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments closely influence some but not the majority of what students produce * Some argument claims and pieces of evidence are predictable, some are original	* Many students demonstrate originality and independence of thinking * Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are not simply replicated by student work * Many or most argument claims, evidence, and examples of refutation demonstrate independence of thought	* Almost all students demonstrate originality and independence of thinking * Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are not replicated by student work * Student argumentation generates original insights and ideas on the content that most students acknowledge and understand
Contextualization and Connections of Argument-Centered Activities and Projects	* Very little to no contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context * Few if any connections made in the classroom between arguments in multiple units or projects	* Partial or limited contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context * Some limited connections made in the classroom between arguments in multiple units or projects	* Solid, rounded contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context * Regular connections made in the classroom by the teacher between arguments in multiple units or projects	* Insightful contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context * Important, advancing connections made in the classroom by both the teacher and students between arguments in multiple units or projects
Use of Data to Reach Every Student	* Little to no use of data to devise strategies to reach every student * An absence of differentiation in instructional delivery or learning culture * Small group(s) of students visibly outside of the main learning community in the classroom	* Occasional, but unsystematic, use of data to devise strategies to reach every student * Some attempts at differentiation in instructional delivery and learning culture * Up to a few individual students may be outside the main learning community in the classroom	* Proficient use of data to devise strategies to reach every student * Regular, effective attempts at differentiation in instructional delivery and learning culture * No students visibly outside the main learning community in the classroom	* Systematic, creative use of data to devise innovative strategies to reach every student * Thorough, highly effective differentiation in instructional develivery and learning culture * All students visibly within the main learning community in the classroom
Pervasive Dynamism and Energy	* Inconsistent energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher * Little energy demonstrated by students * Sparse interest or passion evoked by the issues or arguments	* Mostly consistent but not highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher * Middling energy demonstrated by most students; higher energy demonstrated only by a few students * Real interest or passion evoked by the issues or arguments among many students	* Consistent and occasionally highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher * Real energy demonstrated by most students; higher energy demonstrated by some students * Signifcant interest and passion evoked by the issues and arguments among most students	* Highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher * High energy demonstrated by most students * Signifcant interest and passion evoked by the issues and arguments among most students that visibly bolsters student work effort

Basic Information								

Teacher:			Course/Date:		Evaluator:			

OACIC Ratings								
Curriculum	Language & Concepts	Issues & Controversies	Creative & Differentiated	Coherence & Integration	Objectives & Activities	Assessment	AVE.	TOTAL
							0.00	0.0
Instruction	Language & Concepts	Evidence Standard	Refutation Standard	Questioning & Discussion	Management	Feedback to Students	AVE.	TOTAL
							0.00	0.0
Culture	Assimilation of Argument	Student-to-Student	Originality of Thought	Context & Connections	Data & Differentiation	Dynamism & Energy	AVE.	TOTAL
							0.00	0.0
							TOTAL AVE.	**GRAND TOTAL**
							0.00	**0.0**

Comments								
Curriculum								
Instruction								
Culture								
Overall								