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, rigourous 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