Scoring Key: Grade 11

Argumentative Performance Task

Focus Standards

Grade 11: W.11-12.1 a, c, e; 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
ORGANIZATION AND PURPOSE	The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused: • claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience • consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • effective introduction and conclusion • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety • alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*	The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused: • claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience • adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas • adequate introduction an conclusion • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas • alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*	The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus: • claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience • inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety • introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas • alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged *	The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus: • claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience • few or no transitional strategies are evident • introduction and/or conclusion may be missing • frequent extraneous ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression • alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged *	 Insufficient (includes copied text) In a language other than English Off-topic Off-purpose

^{*}Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P A The response has an adequate organizational structure and progression of ideas from beginning to end. The claim is consistent throughout the response and is sufficiently developed. The writer indicates the problem with the current youth and the need for change, which financial literacy courses offer. Paragraph 2 discusses how students need financial literacy to make good life decisions. The topic sentence is at the end of paragraph 2 ("If Americans had the correct education it would be simple to increase the understanding of financial literacy in younger generations."), which is effective here because it provides strong contrast with the counterclaim that starts paragraph 3.

There is no explicit transition between paragraphs 2 and 3, but sufficient transitions within each paragraph make the connection clear between the need for financial literacy and the benefits it will provide ("If Americans," "But if"). Paragraph 3 indicates the lack of financial literacy and the need to create the course into more real life situations. ("Source 2 claims that even with the proper training students don't understand financial literacy as well as they should.")

The counterargument is adequately addressed and refuted. ("Some argue against these financial literacy classes . . . But if courses were to change and relate to real life situations more, people would take the class seriously and get a lot out of it.") The writer refutes the counterclaim in a moderate and well-reasoned way by agreeing with the concern, but stating that the courses, if modified, can lead to student success.

The introduction and conclusion are adequate for the purpose. The conclusion ends with future implications ("Americans need proper training and preparation to maintain a healthy and stable adult life."). Although the writer restates the claim, this is acceptable use of a conclusion paragraph.

The response does not fully develop all thoughts or maintain a consistently strong focus. However, the logical progression from beginning to end and mostly maintained focus on the claim results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 3 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P B

1

The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus.

The claim of the response is relatively clear: "I think that the schools should be teaching financial literacy because it can help teens in high school the value of spending, and saving money". However, the response is too brief to provide any focus to the claim or progression of ideas. There are few transitions ("Another one"). The progression of ideas is unclear; paragraph 1 provides several seemingly unrelated details ("Credit cards are good to have for emergances but not all the time."). The response lacks a clear essay format with an introduction, conclusion, and body paragraphs. Although the response does attempt to acknowledge another view, it is not associated with the claim. ("Financial literacy is important in many lives and may not be important to some people because they don't care or plan or living with their parents.").

An overall lack of focus results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 1 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P C The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus.

The writer's claim that financial literacy courses should not be offered ("People should learn on their own when it comes to these things and should not depend on financial courses to aid them.") finds little support from the sources provided in this performance task and is difficult to support with a variety of supporting reasons. As a result, the writer repeats ideas within each paragraph. Both the paragraphs 2 and 3 discuss the need for independent financial learning, along with the idea that classes are a waste of time ("Why waste the time taking a pointless class when someone can be taking other classes that will have more of an effect on their knowledge."). The counter-argument is confusing and inadequately acknowledged ("Although many people believe that these financial courses can better an american citizen with poor handling skills decision making with money"). The transitions are inconsistent to maintain the claim (Although, Finally). Due in large part to the repetition of ideas, there is not a consistent progression of ideas from beginning to end. The connection between ideas in the response is sometimes unclear ("teens today take the courses, they are not exercising independence"). The introduction is adequate, but the conclusion only repeats the introduction.

Repetition of ideas, as well as no progression of thoughts, from beginning to end results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 2 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P D

2

The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus.

The main claim and purpose of this response is maintained throughout the essay. The writer maintains the importance of financial literacy classes for managing money and saving for the real world. However, although the purpose is maintained, the response becomes repetitive and the argument is only focused around one reason: the need to understand money. The paragraph 2 identifies the need for financial literacy due to a lack of understanding. The paragraph 3 acknowledges that there is a counterclaim ("Some might say that a financial literacy class is not needed but thats not true"); however, the writer does not explain or address the substance of the counterclaim. Transitions are limited in the response, but some limited functional transitions are included ("yet"; "also") to address the need for financial literacy. The conclusion repeats the claim that is asserted throughout the response.

A maintained purpose that lacks progression of ideas with minimal transitions and weak acknowledgment of the counterclaim results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 2 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P E

2

The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus.

The response begins with a strong introduction of the claim, preceded by appropriate rhetorical questions ("What will happen when they have to manage their finances on their own and mom and dad aren't there to help them?" "This is why every state needs to put a financial literacy class into their high schools as a course needed to graduate"). However, the claim is not sustained consistently from beginning to end. The writer discusses the importance of financial literacy but does not return to the specific claim until the topic sentence of the paragraph 3 ("The most difficult thing for students to do is to go out into the real world with no sense of financial responsibility."). There is an uneven progression of ideas, and the response deviates from the topic for tangential ideas such as the discussion of gas use in paragraph 2 and the importance of financial problems of kids and adults in paragraph 5 ("The most important problem here is the kids, not the adults"). The response shows limited use of transitions, relying primarily on cause and effect statements for transitions ("If"; "then"). The writer does acknowledge the existence of a counterclaim ("Now people might say that putting a financial literature class in schools is bad for them, but it really isn't.") but does not provide any detail about this opposing stance. Therefore the counterclaim is refuted without being properly addressed or explained. The introduction is appropriate in its use of rhetorical questions and its clear statement of the claim, and the conclusion summarizes the reader's hopeful outcome ("Now the board needs to put the class in every school in the country if they want a stable economy.").

Overall, the response lacks a clear progression of ideas from beginning to end, as well as a lack of sustained purpose; therefore, is given a holistic score of a 2 for Organization/Purpose.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P F

3

The response has a clear claim which is reasserted in the introduction and the conclusion paragraphs. The claim is adequately introduced with the problem (graduate high school with a very limited understanding of how to handle their money) and the solution, which is then laid out in more detail throughout the response. Although the claim is formulaic, it provides a clear map of what will be discussed in the response. The writer identifies three benefits for including financial education in high school (educate about financial responsibilities, navigate the complexities of the modern economy, and train students on the importance of finances). Many transitions are used, but they sometimes awkwardly connect the logic and progression between ideas ("but 37 states have no such requirements. Without the courses...") The length of the paragraphs sometimes causes confusion and lack of focus as well.

The progression of ideas is adequate but not always effective, and the focus is mostly maintained. For instance, the response attempts to connect financial literacy to the economy as a whole in the third paragraph, but within that paragraph the focus shifts to people's individual economic status. There is no evidence to support the claim that financial literacy courses improve the economy, which is separately scored in Evidence/Elaboration but also affects the progression of ideas.

The topic sentence of each paragraph adequately introduces the information in the paragraph as well as loosely transition from the previous paragraph ("In addition to personal advantages for the students," "financial literacy classes can also greatly help the economy"). The writer weakly addresses the counter argument (Many people have concluded that financial literacy is ineffective and a waste of money, but really, it does a great of assisting students and preparing them for the future.... Although people disagree on the effectiveness of financial literacy courses, it still stands that they are a great resource for students to prepare for the future.) The topic sentence for this paragraph allows for the writer to produce a counter quote, but the response fails to provide evidence for the counter.

Although functional, the conclusion mainly repeats the thoughts of the introduction and the claim.

Adequate maintenance of purpose and progression of ideas from beginning to end result in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 3 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P G

4

The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused.

The writer has solid control of the purpose and the structure of an argumentative essay and uses this control to provide a comprehensive response. The introduction and conclusion are clear and effective without repeating information. The introduction begins effectively with a real-world scenario which progresses to the main claim, and the conclusion adds a new but logical extension of ideas ("Financial literacy classes must be added to allow our society to progress."). The claim in this response, which is maintained strongly throughout the paper, is that financial literacy classes will eliminate debt, provide people chances to pay for further education, and provide real-world education before people need it (so they are better prepared when "it matters").

There is a smooth transition of ideas from paragraphs 2 to 3. Paragraph 3 effectively transitions and connects the elimination of debt to continuing higher education and furthering the U.S. economy. The writer is also consistent in the use of transitional phrases ("As well as," "But what the students . . .") between thoughts and ideas within each paragraph to emphasize the claim. The writer effectively addresses the counter claim and refutes the alternate viewpoint ("But what the students learn at such a young age cannot be found anywhere else unless they are placed in the real world").

The response has clear focus that is maintained and communicated throughout the progression of the essay, which results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 4 for this response.



SCORE

SCORE JUSTIFICATION

Sample Grade 11 O/P H

3

The response has an obvious organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization of the response is adequately sustained and generally focused on the topic that students think they "know everything" but really need financial literacy to be successful.

The writer's claim is clear ("The better suggestion would be to have a financial money managing class because in reality we need to know how to do things like pay bills and learn how to buy a house . . ."). The topic sentences are not explicitly stated, but they are implied within each body paragraph and discussed after the quotations. Transitions between ideas are limited ("But," "While yes sometimes"), but the progression of ideas is adequate from beginning to end. The concluding sentence of paragraph 2 leads into the counterclaim of paragraph 3. The counterclaim is adequately addressed and refuted ("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 guidence and tips for later on in life."). The response also acknowledges that there may be issues with the current way the course is taught, but states that this does not mean we should give up on the idea.

The introduction and conclusion are functionally adequate, although the conclusion paragraph is repetitive and the wording is somewhat unclear.

Overall, a coherent progression of ideas from beginning to end and maintenance of the claim results in a holistic Organization/Purpose score of 3 for this response.

