

Scoring Key: Grade 11

Argumentative Performance Task

Focus Standards

Grade 11: W.11–12.1b, d; W.11–12.4; W.11–12.5

4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific clear citations or attribution to source material effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques* vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose effective, appropriate style enhances content 	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general adequate use of citations or attribution to source material adequate use of some elaborative techniques* vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose generally appropriate style is evident 	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied weak use of citations or attribution to source material weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style 	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose little or no evidence of appropriate style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient (includes copied text) In a language other than English Off-topic Off-purpose

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).

**General layered elaboration: A sentence-to-sentence progression of source-based arguments, facts, details, and/or source-based evidence that generally develops and supports the claim. Source-based evidence, if present, may be in the form of general or imprecise references. Re-ordering of the text might impair the connection of ideas.

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E A	3	<p data-bbox="527 350 1944 418">The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language.</p> <p data-bbox="527 444 1944 672">The writer provides numerous examples of source material throughout the response, directly quoting from multiple sources throughout the response, and the writer integrates those sources well, providing clear attributions and strong context for the embedded quotations. For example, in paragraph 1, the writer references the article title (“Working Financial Literacy in With the Three R’s”), author (Tara Siegel Bernard), and the source (<i>New York Times</i>). This type of specificity is maintained throughout the response as the writer presents some varied elaborative techniques, such as expert statements, facts/statistics, and direct text quotations from the articles. Additionally, the writer uses vocabulary that is appropriate to the purpose and audience.</p> <p data-bbox="527 698 1944 964">However, the writer does not use elaboration effectively in a consistent manner throughout. For example, in the paragraph 1, the writer makes a point that students need a financial literacy class in order to “prepare themselves for the responsibilities that come with finances.” Yet the source evidence that follows addresses the number of states that offer personal finance classes. There is no direct connection between the number of states requiring students to take classes and preparing students for financial responsibilities, so the evidence generally supports the idea for a need for classes without directly addressing the need for responsibility indicated by the writer. However, the evidence and elaboration are certainly not weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied, and the writer’s use of evidence and elaboration can be characterized as adequate, thus reflecting the characteristics of a score 3.</p> <p data-bbox="527 990 1902 1057">While the response demonstrates many strengths and some characteristics of a level 4 response, the best holistic Evidence/Elaboration score for this response is a 3.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E B	3	<p>The response, overall, provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language.</p> <p>Throughout the body paragraphs, the writer does provide evidence to support the central claim of the response, though the reasoning and elaboration is not always thorough or convincing. In paragraph 2, for instance, the writer begins with a claim that financial literacy is a topic “too important to be ignored.” The writer then provides an expert statement from a source, indicating that according to Tara Siegel Bernard, “Just 13 states require students to take a personal finance course or include the subject of economics course before they graduate” The writer elaborates on the evidence by explaining that “[the number of states] is way too little in this big country of ours.” While the conclusion made by the writer has merit given the statistics provided, the writer continues by providing elaboration that does not directly build upon or extend the point in the previous statement clearly. “Think about it,” the writer states, “if a person owns a car, they are going to be spending close to a hundred dollars every week or two on gas. If they don’t have any money smarts on saving or spending, they are going to be filling their car up every couple of days from driving constantly.” On the surface, there seems to be no clear connection to the previous statement; however, the writer attempts to equate a lack of financial education with the effects of not knowing or understanding how to budget, save, or spend appropriately. In this case, the writer suggests that an uneducated individual may not have enough financial literacy to budget or monitor excessive spending on gas. As a result, the sample represents the score 3 descriptor with an “adequate use of elaborative techniques.” Since the elaboration is not completely effective when considering the concerns previously mentioned, a score of 4 would not be appropriate.</p> <p>In terms of evidence, while the writer does utilize context to introduce and embed quotations in the paragraphs 2 and 4, the writer uses “floating quotations” throughout paragraph 3 without embedding them effectively to include context. The lack of context makes some of the references too general. For example, the evidence lacks specificity in terms of the credentials of the experts or authors quoted. As a result, overall, the writer provides “adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general.” Otherwise, the vocabulary and style are generally appropriate for the audience, and the attribution to source material is adequate. The word choice does not reflect the more elevated language expected in a score 4 response, but it is not weak or inconsistent. Likewise, the sources do have some variation in attribution, but there is no consistency in the process. Sometimes the quoted author’s name is presented after the quotation through a parenthetical citation, and sometimes it appears in the context of the embedded quotation. Since the prompt does not require any standardized method for citations, the writer’s usage is therefore adequate.</p> <p>Holistically, the best Evidence/Elaboration score for this response is a 3.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E C	1	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague and lacks clarity.</p> <p>Using minimal elaboration of a single point, the writer does provide some reasoned analysis, making a simple connection between spending behaviors and the financial literacy: “[M]ost people are going to blow there money or be short on their bills if they don’t get educated on this.” The writer then concludes with an additional rationale for financial education that is simplistic and demonstrates minimal reasoning, stating that “[m]ost seniors have no clases so why not give them this one.” However, the response includes no source material, providing no opportunity for citations/attribution, and the writer expresses his/her ideas through simplistic language without any evident academic style.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E D	3	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language.</p> <p>In supporting the claim that financial courses should be required to “help students manage their own money and possibly the income of their future business,” this response presents comprehensive evidence in both body paragraphs. In paragraph 2, for example, to support the idea that such courses will make students more “financially responsible,” the writer cites the Bernard source, stating “students who came from states where there was a course required were more likely to budget, were more likely to be saving, and were less likely to have maxed out their credit cards.” The student also cites the Davis article, pointing out that “studies have shown that only 26 percent of 13-to-21 year olds reported that their parents actively taught them how to manage money.” Both pieces of evidence are sufficiently valid, relevant, and specific to support the main idea of the paragraph; however, the elaboration is just adequate in the paragraph. After presenting the statement from the Bernard article, the writer explains, “This explicitly shows that an early influence and education about budgeting can lead to much more cautious spending, even into adulthood.” The writer ends the discussion of the point with this single statement, simply moving into an introduction of the Davis evidence, transitioning with “[y]ou mat argue that finances shouldn’t be taught at school, but at home.” Not fully developed, the transition seemingly establishes a counterargument, but the writer does not fully develop that idea in any elaboration to follow. In fact, the paragraph abruptly ends after a simple analysis of the example from the Davis article that is presented.</p> <p>Otherwise, the overall vocabulary and style is generally appropriate. There are no prominent examples of elevated academic language or notable elements of style. Additionally, while the writer does manage to include the various article authors and titles when introducing the text evidence, the attribution to source material is not completely accurate. In the paragraph 2, the direct quotation from the Bernard article is actually a statement by Professor Michael S. Gutter, and the evidence presented from the Davis article relates a statement by parent/ teacher Patricia Hummel. As a result, the attribution to sources is weak, lacking a sophisticated acknowledgement of the specific source of the evidence.</p> <p>While the response demonstrates some characteristics of both level 4 and level 2, the preponderance of evidence places this sample solidly at an Evidence/Elaboration score of 3.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E E	2	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language.</p> <p>Overall, the writer has much to say in this response, providing source examples and citations/attributions to sources adequately throughout the essay. In the first body paragraph, for example, the writer references the Thaler article when introducing a direct quotation and includes a more standardized parenthetical citation, (Thaler 6), after a second direct quotation from the source. Much of the elaboration throughout the response, though, is problematic. Much of the subsequent commentary/reasoning does not effectively elaborate on the integrated text evidence, thus demonstrating uneven use of elaborative techniques.</p> <p>In the first body paragraph, the writer clearly makes a point stating that financial literacy classes “have not been very successful” and appropriately elaborates by presenting supporting text evidence indicating that “many Americans flunk when it comes to financial literacy.” However, the elaboration that follows lacks a logical connection in developing the overall point. As the writer states, “Most Americans struggle with their spending habits because of the variety of stuff we are able to buy. Most countries do not have as many things available like Americans do.” The writer’s comments, regardless of how valid they may be, in no clear way develop the previous point regarding the failing status of Americans’ financial literacy. More importantly, the writer’s elaboration does NOT directly support the main point of the paragraph, which claims that financial education classes have not been successful. The reference to the availability of “things” available to other countries seems incongruent, off the topic, or just undeveloped, since no elaboration of the point is made.</p> <p>Additionally, the subsequent body paragraphs display similar, problematic characteristics in the development of the elaboration. The evidence in the second body paragraph essentially repeats the prior arguments made, bemoaning teen spending habits and recognizing the lack of financial education: “Teens spend their money on the newest thing that came out to show off, but they never say for big items like a car or the money they are going to spend during break because their parents will supply more money. Because ‘most americans aren’t fluent the language of money’ (Bernard1).” Likewise, in the third paragraph, the writer moves to a tangential argument focused on the implementation of a mandatory financial literacy class for teens, and when elaborating, the writer integrates source evidence, “The \$600,000 is a low cost if the course is effective’ (Davis10) which it is so it is not a waste of money.” The development, though, lacks a reasoned analysis by failing to clearly articulate the purpose of the points being made in the paragraph and its relevance to the central claim of the essay.</p> <p>Although this response demonstrates some characteristics of score level 3, the uneven elaboration and sometimes weak integration of evidence result in a holistic score of 2.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E F	4	<p data-bbox="527 350 1934 456">Overall, considering the on-demand nature of the task, this response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language.</p> <p data-bbox="527 483 1934 870">The response provides thorough, relevant, and convincing elaboration in each paragraph. For example, in paragraph 2, after the assertion regarding the complex nature of the economy and the little chance one has for survival, the writer employs metaphor/analogy, comparing those without a financial education to “a wounded gazelle in front of a pack of hungry lions” to reinforce the point. Immediately thereafter, the writer varies the elaboration by citing facts from the source, as well as directly quoting from a source: “Few states have made financial literacy courses a requirement and college students coming from these states are ‘less likely to have maxed out their credit cards in the last year’ (Bernard 13).” The subsequent paragraphs similarly present a variety of elaborative techniques that develop the writer’s focus and assertions. For example, in addition to other facts and direct quotations, and conclusions as support, the writer uses reasoning in paragraph 3: “Parents start college funds for their kids as soon as they are born and more often than not, it is never enough. This forces college students into getting student-loans, which cannot be paid off because they have no steady income large enough to keep up with the payments.”</p> <p data-bbox="527 898 1934 1205">Finally, not only does the response include clear citations (references to both the Bernard and Davis sources), the writer utilizes an effective, appropriate style to enhance the content and vocabulary that is clearly appropriate for audience and purpose. In addition to the gazelle analogy/metaphor mentioned previously, the writer nicely varies sentence types and length to punctuate ideas. Short exclamatory or declarative statements (“We MUST educate our youth!” in paragraph 2 and “This cannot happen” in paragraph 3) juxtapose the more complex sentences, such as the thesis (“If these people were forced to take financial literacy classes during their educational years they would have no debt, be able to afford further education and get real world practice before it matters” in paragraph 1). Likewise, word choice found in the language throughout the response—“recession,” “spiral,” “dignity”—in addition to many strong, active verbs and limited use of “to be” verbs, enhances the precision and overall linguistic quality of the response.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E G	2	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language.</p> <p>The writer clearly demonstrates an appropriate personal style, making statements such as teenagers “starve for independence” and “act like know-it-alls,” or acknowledging that teens need assistance in managing money because the “truth is the first Taco Bell we see after earning our checks is going to-be in our future.” However, vocabulary overall is simplistic and informal.</p> <p>More importantly, the use of evidence and elaboration lacks effective development. The response does include source material, specifically in the form of direct quotations. The second body paragraph, for example, begins with a quotation: “We’re expected to make big financial decisions as early as our teens’ (1),” and the writer even follows up with logical analysis: “Whether it is buying a laptop or paying for college these are things we have to learn how to do. While yes sometimes it’s ‘easier’ to just go out and do and learn as you go, it would benefit us more if we (teens) had a class that provide us guidance and tips for later on in life.” However, the elaboration is cursory, and the quotations are not integrated well, lacking specific and clear identification of speakers or context. In the second body paragraph, the writer simply presents a quotation as the first sentence with no context and no clear attribution other than what seems to be the source number in parentheses.</p> <p>Holistically, the best Evidence/Elaboration score for this response is a 2.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 11 E/E H	2	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language.</p> <p>The writer provides some source evidence in paragraphs 2 and 3, referencing the ideas in the Burns article and citing a direct quotation by Scott Truelove, respectively, as well as providing adequate attributions. However, the evidence and the subsequent elaboration is minimal, establishing a simple/cursory treatment of the topic. In fact, the development consists primarily of source material. In paragraph 2, after the initial statement that “[financial literacy] classes just get students over-confident in their skills,” the writer elaborates by presenting more evidence from the source: “But studies showed that students who took the course were more likely to budget, more likely to be saving, more likely to pay off credit cards, and less likely to have maxed out credit cards.” There is no attempt to develop reasoned commentary or analysis to build a layered elaboration based on the evidence. As a result of weak elaborative techniques and over-reliance on source material, the writer neither establishes nor develops an effective voice or style.</p> <p>Although the response demonstrates some characteristics of a score level 1, the preponderance of evidence places this paper in the lower end of the range for score level 2.</p>