

Argument-Centered Culture Component	1 Learning	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Expert
<b>Assimilation of the Norms, Practices, and Terms of Academic Argument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are unfamiliar or alien to students</li> <li>* Numerous students demonstrate mistaken understanding of argument norms or terms</li> <li>* Students generally uncomfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are partially familiar to most students</li> <li>* Students generally demonstrate a limited understanding of argument norms and terms</li> <li>* Students somewhat comfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are familiar to most students</li> <li>* Students generally demonstrate a solid understanding of argument norms and terms</li> <li>* Students are comfortable with practices and procedures of argumentation, and they apply them appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Norms, practices, and terms of academic argument are thoroughly familiar to, and have been assimilated by, almost all students</li> <li>* Students demonstrate an advanced understanding of argument norms or terms</li> <li>* Students are able to "see through the lens" of argument to get to advanced content and ideas</li> </ul>
<b>Student Engagement with Other Students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Very little to no student engagement with other students</li> <li>* No understanding of argument constructs or stems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Occasional, limited student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments</li> <li>* Partial understanding and ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems</li> <li>* Students rarely or infrequently engage other students when not explicitly prodded to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Frequent student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments</li> <li>* Most students demonstrate the ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems</li> <li>* Students sometimes engage other students even when not explicitly prodded to do so</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Student engagement with other students on relevant content and arguments commonly and sometimes highly insightfully</li> <li>* Almost all students demonstrate the ability to use a range of argument and refutation constructs and stems</li> <li>* Students frequently engage other students even when not explicitly prodded to do so</li> </ul>
<b>Originality and Independence of Student Thinking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Very little to no originality and independence of student thinking</li> <li>* Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are often closely replicated by students</li> <li>* Argument claims and evidence all highly predictable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Some limited originality and independence of student thinking</li> <li>* Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments closely influence some but not the majority of what students produce</li> <li>* Some argument claims and pieces of evidence are predictable, some are original</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Many students demonstrate originality and independence of thinking</li> <li>* Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are not simply replicated by student work</li> <li>* Many or most argument claims, evidence, and examples of refutation demonstrate independence of thought</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Almost all students demonstrate originality and independence of thinking</li> <li>* Models used to teach arguments and counter-arguments are not replicated by student work</li> <li>* Student argumentation generates original insights and ideas on the content that most students acknowledge and understand</li> </ul>
<b>Contextualization and Connections of Argument-Centered Activities and Projects</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Very little to no contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context</li> <li>* Few if any connections made in the classroom between arguments in multiple units or projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Partial or limited contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context</li> <li>* Some limited connections made in the classroom between arguments in multiple units or projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Solid, rounded contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context</li> <li>* Regular connections made in the classroom by the teacher between arguments in multiple units or projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Insightful contextualization of argumentation in class within the broader disciplinary or social context</li> <li>* Important, advancing connections made in the classroom by both the teacher and students between arguments in multiple units or projects</li> </ul>
<b>Use of Data to Reach Every Student</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Little to no use of data to devise strategies to reach every student</li> <li>* An absence of differentiation in instructional delivery or learning culture</li> <li>* Small group(s) of students visibly outside of the main learning community in the classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Occasional, but unsystematic, use of data to devise strategies to reach every student</li> <li>* Some attempts at differentiation in instructional delivery and learning culture</li> <li>* Up to a few individual students may be outside the main learning community in the classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Proficient use of data to devise strategies to reach every student</li> <li>* Regular, effective attempts at differentiation in instructional delivery and learning culture</li> <li>* No students visibly outside the main learning community in the classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Systematic, creative use of data to devise innovative strategies to reach every student</li> <li>* Thorough, highly effective differentiation in instructional delivery and learning culture</li> <li>* All students visibly within the main learning community in the classroom</li> </ul>
<b>Pervasive Dynamism and Energy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Inconsistent energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher</li> <li>* Little energy demonstrated by students</li> <li>* Sparse interest or passion evoked by the issues or arguments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Mostly consistent but not highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher</li> <li>* Middling energy demonstrated by most students; higher energy demonstrated only by a few students</li> <li>* Real interest or passion evoked by the issues or arguments among many students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Consistent and occasionally highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher</li> <li>* Real energy demonstrated by most students; higher energy demonstrated by some students</li> <li>* Significant interest and passion evoked by the issues and arguments among most students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Highly dynamic energy brought to classroom instruction by the teacher</li> <li>* High energy demonstrated by most students</li> <li>* Significant interest and passion evoked by the issues and arguments among most students that visibly bolsters student work effort</li> </ul>