



**English Language Arts
Grade 6**

Sample Text-Dependent Writing Item

**To Persuade
(through Argument)**

Table of Contents

General Introduction	1
Purpose	1
To Persuade (through Argument) Rubric	2
Text-Dependent Writing (TDW) Passage and Task	6
Sample Student Responses and Annotations	9
Sample 1 Student Response – Score Point 4	9
Sample 2 Student Response – Score Point 4	13
Sample 3 Student Response – Score Point 3	17
Sample 4 Student Response – Score Point 3	21
Sample 5 Student Response – Score Point 2	24
Sample 6 Student Response – Score Point 2	28
Sample 7 Student Response – Score Point 1	31
Sample 8 Student Response – Score Point 1	34
Sample 9 Student Response – Score Point 0	37
Sample 10 Student Response – Score Point 0	38

General Introduction

The South Carolina Department of Education provides districts and schools with tools to assist in delivering focused instruction aligned with the South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards. The Text-Dependent Writing (TDW) sampler was designed as a resource for South Carolina educators to provide guidance and clarity around state summative assessment.

This document contains an example of an argumentative TDW from the SC READY English Language Arts assessment. The TDW item is composed of a reading passage(s) and a writing task aligned to the *2024 South Carolina College- and Career-Ready English Language Arts Standards*. The passage(s) and task were reviewed by a committee of South Carolina educators to ensure appropriateness for the intended grade in terms of text complexity, wording, topic, and bias.

The TDW item requires that students read a passage(s) and respond to a task while drawing upon the text for their written responses. Embedded within the TDW item is a mode-specific writer's checklist. Students can use the embedded writer's checklist to help them plan, write, and proofread their responses. Each student's response is then scored using the SC READY TDW Scoring Guidelines.

The TDW sampler contains student responses that illustrate the score points described in the holistic rubric and represent a point range of 4 (highest) to 1 (lowest). These responses contain a combination of reader-scored responses and teacher committee-scored responses established during rangefinding. Each response is scored holistically by domain: structure, development, and language. Scores within each domain are earned by demonstrating most of the descriptors within a score point.

- 4 points: The 4-point response is a **well-developed argument** that examines a topic and skillfully supports claims with clear reasons and relevant text-based evidence.
- 3 points: The 3-point response is a **complete argument** that develops and supports claims with sufficient text-based evidence.
- 2 points: The 2-point response is an **incomplete argument** that partially supports claims with loosely related text-based evidence.
- 1 point: The 1-point response is a **weak attempt to write an argument** and does not support claims with adequate text-based evidence.

Purpose

This document is intended to be a resource for educators; it is not designed to be a practice test for students. The sample items are examples of college- and career-ready assessment items. SC READY assesses content standards in a variety of ways. This document does not include all item types or standards.

To Persuade (through Argument) Rubric

4 points – A well-developed argument that examines a topic and skillfully supports claims with clear reasons and relevant text-based evidence.

Structure

- Skillfully introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response
- Uses an organizational structure that strengthens the response
- Uses varied transitional words and phrases to skillfully connect ideas and enhance the development of the argument
- Provides a well-crafted concluding statement or section that supports the argument

Development

- Skillfully integrates reasons and/or reasoning that may be supported by facts, evidence, and/or data from the text(s)
- Skillfully integrates elaboration of thoughts that includes original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument
- Skillfully acknowledges an alternative perspective

Language

- Uses precise language and vocabulary to skillfully inform and explain about the task
- Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the skillful development of ideas
- Has very few or no errors in grammar usage and conventions
- Uses a tone and/or voice that strengthens the overall response

3 points – A complete argument that develops and supports claims with sufficient text-based evidence.

Structure

- Introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response
- Uses an organizational structure appropriate to the purpose and task
- Uses varied transitional words and phrases to connect ideas and develop the argument
- Provides a concluding statement or section that supports the argument

Development

- Uses logical reasoning supported by facts and/or data as evidence from the text(s)
- Includes elaboration of thoughts that may consist of original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument
- Acknowledges an alternative perspective

Language

- Uses precise language to inform and explain about the task
- Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the development of ideas
- Has a few minor errors in grammar usage and conventions with no significant effect on readability

2 points – An incomplete argument that partially supports claims with loosely related text-based evidence.

Structure

- Introduces a claim that may be unclear or loosely related to the task
- Inconsistently maintains focus on the claim throughout the response
- Uses a weak or ineffective organizational structure that does not develop the argument
- Uses transitions to inconsistently connect ideas
- Provides a concluding statement or section that is repetitive, simplistic, or ineffective

Development

- Partially develops the argument using facts and/or evidence
- Minimally elaborates on thoughts, and may rely too heavily on the text
- Lacks acknowledgment of an alternative perspective

Language

- Uses vocabulary and word choice that is limited or inconsistent to inform and explain about the task
- Uses varied sentence types and phrases ineffectively
- Has frequent errors in grammar usage and conventions that sometimes interfere with readability

1 point – A weak attempt to write an argument and does not support claims with adequate text-based evidence.

Structure

- Makes a claim that may be unclear or demonstrates a lack of awareness of the tasks
- Demonstrates little to no organizational structure
- Transitions may be missing or confusing
- Concluding statement or section may be missing or unrelated to the topic

Development

- Evidence from the text may be missing or confusing
- Elaboration of thoughts may consist of vague or confusing ideas
- Response is mostly a summary of the text

Language

- Vocabulary and word choice may be unclear or confusing
- Has frequent errors in grammar usage and conventions that significantly interfere with readability

Text-Dependent Writing (TDW) Passage and Task

Read the passages. Then respond to the TDW task.

The Netherlands: A Brilliant Country

The Netherlands is a country in northwestern Europe. The name “Netherlands” means “low country.” That is an appropriate name for this region of the world. That is because about twenty-five percent of the country is made up of land that has been reclaimed from the sea.

The Dutch—the people who live in the Netherlands—devised brilliant ways to push seawater off the land. They built walls and dams to block off a portion of the sea. Then, they used windmills to pump the water out. They built canals and other waterways to move the water to places where it was needed. The dry land could then be used for other purposes.

The reclaimed land is called polder land. Polder land is some of the healthiest farmland in the country. It has fertile soil due to the nutrients that had settled on the seabed. One of the things grown in polder land is flowers, especially tulips. The Netherlands is famous for its tulips.

Besides creating good-quality farmland, there are many reasons why it is a good idea for the Dutch to reclaim this land. First, the reclaimed land provides space for people to live. The Netherlands is one of the most densely populated countries in Europe. Relative to other countries, there is only a little land per person, so all the people who live there have to squeeze into any available space. If more land were available, people could move out of crowded areas and live in places with more open space.

Another reason to reclaim land is that it protects the country from seasonal flooding. Three major rivers empty into the sea in the Netherlands. In years when the rivers run heavy, the water can overflow and flood nearby communities. However, with a system to reclaim land, flooding is less likely to happen. The dams, canals, and ditches help the Dutch control flooding.

The Dutch should continue to make their country larger by reclaiming more land from the sea. The areas they have reclaimed are beautiful, and it would be a benefit to the world if there were more land in the Netherlands.

The Netherlands: Leave Nature Alone

The Netherlands is a low-lying coastal country in Europe, and most of the country is either at sea level or below sea level. For hundreds of years, the Dutch people have lived in the Netherlands. They built engineering projects like walls and canals to block off areas of the North Sea. Then, they used windmills to pump the water off this land. Once the water was gone, they started building homes and establishing farms on the old seabed. This reclaimed land is called polder land, and about twenty-five percent of the Netherlands is land that used to be under the water.

Some people believe these reclamation projects are a bad idea.

Displacing Sea Life

When the water is removed from polder land, so are the plants and animals that once called this portion of the sea home. The ocean might look like one big body of water, but it is not. It is made of many different kinds of ecosystems. What grows in one small part of the sea might not grow anywhere else. Emptying the water from portions of the sea may disrupt the lives of the organisms that live there, resulting in the loss of plant and animal species.

A Risk

The Dutch have built impressive engineering projects to gain land. These projects, however, are not fail-proof. The walls and dams can break if too much pressure is put on them. If a storm comes through the area and pushes huge amounts of ocean water against one of the walls, the dam or wall could become damaged or break. Then, the Dutch would lose all the land that they had tried to gain. Constructing, maintaining, or rebuilding the walls also costs a lot of money.

Expensive to Maintain

As time goes by, walls begin to decay. The Dutch need to make sure that the walls are maintained properly. That costs a lot of money. As a result of sea levels rising, the Dutch may have to build their walls higher to keep the seawater out of their polder land. This will also cost a lot of money. Money used to maintain the walls could be used for more worthwhile purposes. If the Dutch are worried about having enough land for people to live on, perhaps they could build more high-rise apartments where people can live instead of on polder lands.

Stop Reclaiming

The Dutch should stop reclaiming land from the ocean. It will be safer for their people if they stop. They should allow the sea to eventually move back into its original spaces. Then, everything can go back to how nature intended it.

Text-Dependent Writing (TDW) Task

Should the Netherlands reclaim land from the sea (polder land)?

Read both passages about whether the Netherlands should or should not reclaim land from the sea and turn it into polder land. Decide your position on the topic. Then, write an argumentative response to persuade readers to agree with your perspective. Acknowledge an alternative perspective in your response. Use evidence from the passages and your own ideas to support your claim.

Sample Student Responses and Annotations

Sample 1 Student Response – Score Point 4

I believe that you should leave nature alone. The Netherlands are a beautiful country, no doubt about that, and they are famous for their tulips. But, their system of reclaiming land isn't a good idea. It is expensive, interrupts ecosystems, is risky, and it is not a full-proof plan.

First, the system of reclaiming land is extremely expensive. They section off a region of ocean and then they drain it, sending the water off with windmills and canals. As the second passage, 'Leave Nature Alone' states, "They build engineering projects like walls and canals to block off areas of the North Sea. Then, they use windmills to pump the water off this land." This seems like a good idea until you think about what they do next, they build walls to keep the remaining water out. But, these walls can break if the water pressure is too strong, storms can damage them harshly, and basic erosion can disrupt the wall's structure just as badly. As the second passage also states, "... walls and dams can break if too much pressure is put on them. If a storm comes through the area and pushes huge amounts of ocean water against one of the walls, the dam or wall could become damaged or break." The cost of maintaining the walls, rebuilding them, and even building them in the first place must be extremely high. Also, the cost of draining the water from the reclaimed land must also be very expensive. From the cost of machinery, to the cost of workers, it really doesn't seem like a good idea financially.

Second, the movement of reclaiming land is not only expensive, but it also displaces wildlife. Removing water from the polder land also removes all the plants and animals that once called that region their home. As the passage states, "The ocean may look like one big body of water, but it is not. It is made of many different kinds of ecosystems. What grows in one small part of the sea might not grow anywhere else." The ecosystems speckled around the ocean are invaluable to the ocean's health, so displacing ecosystems just to get a new region of land that is too expensive to maintain anyway is just not a good idea. By removing the ocean water, they are putting the sea life at risk and removing valuable wildlife from the planet. That also doesn't seem like a good idea.

But, what about the pros? What about the good things that come with reclaiming? Well, when the Netherlands reclaims land they usually turn it into one of two things: farmland or housing. The Netherlands are becoming more and more crowded. Housing is cramped. If they can expand into the ocean, those problems become less and less urgent. Also, the soil that they get from the reclaimed land is fertile and soft because of all the nutrients and minerals that have settled on the seabed. This land is perfect for growing flowers, especially tulips, and all kinds of crops. As the first passage states, "Polder land is some of the healthiest farmland in the country. It has fertile soil due to the nutrients that have settled on the seabed. One of the things grown in polder land is flowers . . . Relative to other countries, there is only a little land per person, so all the people who live there have to squeeze into any available space. If more land were available, people could move out of crowded areas and live in places with more open space." It sounds great, but sadly, the cons outweigh the pros. With the gain of farmland and housing there also comes a great deal of costs and risks. It isn't safe to have the walls when they could collapse during any storm. And the danger of killing off an entire ecosystem is too risky.

In conclusion, I believe that the Netherlands should leave nature alone. Not only do the costs of maintaining the polder land (reclaimed land) outweigh the housing opportunities, but it also poses a real risk to the population. So, I do not believe that the Netherlands should continue reclaiming land.

Sample 1 Annotation – Score Point 4

Score Point 4 – Exceeds Expectations: A well-developed argument that examines a topic and skillfully supports claims with clear reasons and relevant text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Skillfully introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response:

- “you should leave nature alone. . .their system of reclaiming land isn’t a good idea. It is expensive, interrupts ecosystems, is risky, and it is not a full-proof plan.”

Uses an organizational structure that strengthens the response.

- The writer provides a coherent argument with a strong progression of ideas that effectively persuades the reader.
- The effective introduction states a claim and gives reasons for the writer’s position. These reasons are developed in the body of the response with text support and original thinking. The writer then thoroughly develops and refutes a counterclaim. This leads logically to the ideas in the conclusion.

Uses varied transitional words and phrases to skillfully connect ideas and enhance the development of the argument.

- The transitional topic sentence for paragraph 3 skillfully acknowledges the previous idea of expense.
 - “Second, the movement of reclaiming land is not only expensive, but...”
- The rhetorical questions and answers at the beginning of paragraph 4 assist the reader’s transition to consideration of the alternative perspective.
 - “But, what about the pros? What about the good things that come with reclaiming?”
- Transitions within paragraphs are also skillfully used to connect ideas:
 - “First,” “As the second passage. . .states,” “This seems like,” “But,” “Also,” “From the cost of”
 - “Second,” “Removing water,” “As the passage states,” “By removing the ocean,” “That also”
 - “But,” “What about,” “Well, when,” “If they can expand,” “Also,” “As the first passage states,” “With the gain,” “And the danger”
 - “In conclusion,” “Not only,” “So, I do not believe”

Provides a well-crafted concluding section that supports the argument by reiterating the claim, as well as the reasons for the validity of the writer’s position:

- “Not only do the costs of maintaining the polder land (reclaimed land) outweigh the housing opportunities, but it also poses a real risk to the population. So, I do not believe that the Netherlands should continue reclaiming land.”

DEVELOPMENT

Skillfully integrates reasons and/or reasoning that may be supported by facts, evidence, and/or data from the text(s).

- Each of the reasons is developed with quoted and paraphrased relevant text to effectively support the argument:
 - Reason: “First, the system of reclaiming land is extremely expensive.”
 - ▶ Text support: “They section off a region of ocean. . . They build engineering projects. . . they build walls. . . these walls can break. . .”
 - Reason: “Second, the movement of reclaiming land is not only expensive, but it also displaces wildlife.”
 - ▶ Text support: “removes all the plants and animals. . . The ocean. . . is made of many different kinds of ecosystems. . . might not grow anywhere else.”
 - Reason: “What about the good things that come with reclaiming? Well, when the Netherlands reclaims land they usually turn it into one of two things: farmland or housing.”
 - ▶ Text support: “becoming more and more crowded. . . the soil that they get. . . is fertile. . . This land is perfect for growing. . . Polder land is some of the healthiest farmland. . . there is only a little land per person. . .”

Skillfully integrates elaboration of thoughts that includes original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument.

- The text details integrated with the original thinking strengthen the argument:
 - “This seems like a good idea until you think about what they do next. . . The cost of maintaining the walls, rebuilding them, and even building them in the first place must be extremely high. Also, the cost of draining the water from the reclaimed land must also be very expensive. From the cost of machinery, to the cost of workers, it really doesn’t seem like a good idea financially.”
 - “The ecosystems speckled around the ocean are invaluable to the ocean’s health, so displacing ecosystems just to get a new region of land that is too expensive to maintain anyway is just not a good idea. By removing the ocean water, they are putting the sea life at risk and removing valuable wildlife from the planet. That also doesn’t seem like a good idea.”
 - “It sounds great, but sadly, the cons outweigh the pros. With the gain of farmland and housing there also comes a great deal of costs and risks. It isn’t safe to have the walls when they could collapse during any storm. And the danger of killing off an entire ecosystem is too risky.”

Skillfully acknowledges an alternative perspective.

- In the last body paragraph, the writer develops the alternative perspective with support from the text and original thinking, and then refutes it, persuading the reader that the advantages of having more land for farmland or housing are not worth the risks and expense:
 - “But, what about the pros? What about the good things that come with reclaiming? Well, when the Netherlands reclaims land they usually turn it into one of two things: farmland or housing.”
 - “With the gain of farmland and housing there also comes a great deal of costs and risks. It isn’t safe to have the walls when they could collapse during any storm. And the danger of killing off an entire ecosystem is too risky.”

LANGUAGE**Uses precise language and vocabulary to skillfully inform and explain about the task:**

- “erosion,” “machinery,” “financially,” “wildlife,” “speckled,” “invaluable,” “putting the sea life at risk,” “leave nature alone,” “risky,” “full-proof,” “section off,” “region,” “sending the water off,” “harshly,” “cramped,” “expand,” “urgent,” “the cons outweigh the pros,” “a great deal of costs and risks,” “killing off,” “opportunities”

Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the skillful development of ideas:

- “Also, the cost of draining the water from the reclaimed land must also be very expensive. From the cost of machinery, to the cost of workers, it really doesn’t seem like a good idea financially.”
- “It sounds great, but sadly, the cons outweigh the pros. With the gain of farmland and housing there also comes a great deal of costs and risks.”

Has very few or no errors in grammar usage and conventions. There is a spelling error:

- “opportunities”

Uses a tone and/or voice that strengthens the overall response:

- “The Netherlands are a beautiful country, no doubt about that. . .”
- “This seems like a good idea until you think about what they do next, they build walls to keep the remaining water out.”
- “But, what about the pros? What about the good things that come with reclaiming?”
- “It sounds great, but sadly, the cons outweigh the pros.”

Score Justification

- The response has a strong organizational structure that leads the reader through the argument.
- The effective elaboration combines text support with original thinking to persuade the reader.
- Precise word choice and phrasing, along with sentence variety enhance the response.

Suggestions for Improvement

- The discussion of supporting ideas begins with a large block of text information in each body paragraph. The response would be stronger if there were more original thinking integrated with the text information.

Sample 2 Student Response – Score Point 4

The Dutch people should stop building walls, dams, windmills, canals, and waterways to build polder land and keep sea water out of the Netherlands. By building those and polder land they're ending sea species of plants/animals, putting themselves up for a high risk of losing it all, and losing tons of money.

By blocking the sea water out of the polder land, some species of plants and animals that thrived in that ecosystem are losing their home and life. In the second text, "The Netherlands: Leave Nature Alone" it states "What grows in one small part of the sea might not grow anywhere else. Emptying the water from portions of the sea may disrupt the lives of the organisms that live there, resulting in the loss of plant and animal species." This shows that animals and plants are going extinct because of the loss of their habitat. Though polder land has healthy soil, there are other ways to get healthy fertile soil by taking care of the dry land properly. By stopping polder land, the Netherlands would be a safer, full of life place.

Another con of creating polder land is the risk it has of collapsing. Also in the second text, "The walls and dams can break if too much pressure is put on them. If a storm comes through the area and pushes huge ammounts of ocean water against one of the walls, the dam or wall could become damaged or break." If a storm comes, and that's very likely and normal to happen, all that built up water would put extreme pressure on the dam/wall. When the pressure is put, the wall or dam breaks and floods the polder land filled with life, homes, and buisnesses. Since there is no way to prepare for a storm out of their suddeness and randomness, it puts a high risk of loss. Even with the need for space in the Netherlands because twenty-five percent of it's covered by water, risking lives isn't the answer when we can use the dry land space more wisely, keep the beautiful ocean, and it's life. Polder land is very dangerous to the Netherlands, so if we stopped building it, ocean water wouldn't build up to causing a threat to the life living on it.

Finally, the money the Netherlands loses trying to keep up with the polder lands is not worth it. "As time goes by, walls begin to decay. That costs a lot of money. As a result of sea levels rising, the Dutch may have to build their walls higher to keep the sea water out of their polder larnd." This just simply isn't worth it. The Dutch is spending lots of money, time, and effort to maintain their unsafe polder land. When the walls decay, it puts an even higher risk of collapsing. Just because the dams, canals, ditches, etc. help with seasonal flooding, doesn't mean it is the best way to solve that. If the Netherlands is worried about the seasonal flooding, a better, safer, cheaper, and non risky solution is planting trees. If the Dutch people plant more trees it will make the towns more lively, and help with flooding. The polder lands in the Netherlands is a loss of money.

Overall, the Netherlands should not reclaim land from the sea and turn it into polder land. Polder land is making plant and animal species go extinct, putting risk to the life living on polder land, and causing the Netherlands to lose money and time/effort into keeping up with the sea water blockers.

Sample 2 Annotation – Score Point 4

Score Point 4 – Exceeds Expectations: A well-developed argument that examines a topic and skillfully supports claims with clear reasons and relevant text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Skillfully introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response:

- “The Dutch people should stop building walls, dams, windmills, canals, and waterways to build polder land and keep sea water out of the Netherlands.”

Uses an organizational structure that strengthens the response.

- The response remains strongly and consistently focused on the claim throughout.
- Reasons supporting the claim are thoroughly elaborated on with text and original thinking.
 - Within their elaboration, the writer included an acknowledgement of an alternative perspective for each reason.
- All of this information leads the reader logically to the conclusion of the argument.

Uses varied transitional words and phrases to skillfully connect ideas and enhance the development of the argument:

- “By building those. . .”
- “By blocking the sea water. . .In the second text. . .This shows. . .Though. . .By stopping. . .”
- “Another con. . .Also in the second text. . .If a storm comes. . .When the pressure. . .Since there is. . .Even with. . .”
- “Finally. . .When the walls. . .Just because. . .If the Netherlands. . .If the Dutch. . .”
- “Overall. . .”

Provides a well-crafted concluding section that supports the argument:

- “Overall, the Netherlands should not reclaim land from the sea and turn it into polder land. Polder land is making plant and animal species go extinct, putting risk to the life living on polder land, and causing the Netherlands to lose money and time/effort into keeping up with the sea water blockers.”

DEVELOPMENT

Skillfully integrates reasons and/or reasoning that may be supported by facts, evidence, and/or data from the text(s):

- Reason: “By blocking the sea water out of the polder land, some species of plants and animals that thrived in that ecosystem are losing their home and life.”
 - Text support: “. . .might not grow anywhere else. . .may disrupt the lives of the organisms. . .animals and plants are going extinct. . .”
- Reason: “Another con of creating polder land is the risk it has of collapsing.”
 - Text support: “The walls and dams can break. . .floods the polder land filled with life, homes, and businesses.”
- Reason: “Finally, the money the Netherlands loses trying to keep up with the polder lands is not worth it.”
 - Text support: “walls begin to decay. . .spending lots of money time, and effort. . .even higher risk of collapsing. . .help with seasonal flooding. . .”

Skillfully integrates elaboration of thoughts that includes original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument:

- “This shows that animals and plants are going extinct because of the loss of their habitat. Though polder land has healthy soil, there are other ways to get healthy fertile soil by taking care of the dry land properly. By stopping polder land, the Netherlands would be a safer, full of life place.”
- “Since there is no way to prepare for a storm out of their suddenness and randomness, it puts a high risk of loss. Even with the need for space in the Netherlands because twenty-five percent of it’s covered by water, risking lives isn’t the answer when we can use the dry land space more wisely, keep the beautiful ocean, and it’s life. Polder land is very dangerous to the Netherlands, so if we stopped building it, ocean water wouldn’t build up too causing a threat to the life living on it.”
- “This just simply isn’t worth it. . .Just because the dams, canals, ditches, etc. help with seasonal flooding, doesn’t mean it is the best way to solve that. If the Netherlands is worried about the seasonal flooding, a better, safer, cheaper, and non risky solution is planting trees. If the Dutch people plant more trees it will make the towns more lively, and help with flooding. The polder lands in the Netherlands is a loss of money.”

Skillfully acknowledges and refutes an alternative perspective in each paragraph:

- “Though polder land has healthy soil, there are other ways to get healthy fertile soil by taking care of the dry land properly.”
- “Even with the need for space in the Netherlands because twenty-five percent of it’s covered by water, risking lives isn’t the answer when we can use the dry land space more wisely, keep the beautiful ocean, and it’s life.”
- “Just because the dams, canals, ditches, etc. help with seasonal flooding, doesn’t mean it is the best way to solve that.”

LANGUAGE

Uses precise language and vocabulary to skillfully inform and explain about the task:

- “high risk,” “tons of money,” “thrived,” “extinct,” “habitat,” “full of life place,” “collapsing,” “very likely,” “randomness,” “need for space,” “risking lives,” “threat to the life,” “unsafe polder land,” “lively”

Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the skillful development of ideas:

- “Since there is no way to prepare for a storm out of their suddenness and randomness, it puts a high risk of loss. Even with the need for space in the Netherlands because twenty-five percent of it’s covered by water, risking lives isn’t the answer when we can use the dry land space more wisely, keep the beautiful ocean, and it’s life.”

Has very few or no errors in grammar usage and conventions. There are some spelling errors:

- “theirselves,” “ammounts,” “buisnesses,” “suddeness,” “larnd”

Uses a tone and/or voice that strengthens the overall response:

- “Though polder land has healthy soil, there are other ways to get healthy fertile soil by taking care of the dry land properly. By stopping polder land, the Netherlands would be a safer, full of life place.”

Score Justification

- The response is consistently focused on the claim throughout the response.
- Elaboration is thorough, and there is text support and some original thinking for each idea.
- The alternative perspective is included in the discussion of each supporting reason.
- There is some precise language and sentence variety.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Further integrate text and original thinking within each paragraph.
- Use more precise language to enhance the response.

Sample 3 Student Response – Score Point 3

The argument whether the Dutch should take the polder land has been going on for a while. Some claim that it is unhealthy for the environment while others claim it's helpful for human life and the growing population. I know that taking the polder land will benefit more than it will hurt. This is due to it allowing conveniences to the Dutch population and reducing natural problems.

The convenience of the polder land is due to it allowing rich farm soil and more living space. According to text (The Netherlands: A Brilliant Country), "Polder land is some of the healthiest farmland". This shows that the polder land has rich soil that we can use to our advantage for farming crops and even our famous tulips. Next the text also says, "reclaimed land provides space for people to live." This shows that this newly reclaimed polder land can be used for spreading out the dense population in the Netherlands. But can't we build bigger buildings? Yes, but that will require more resources thus leading to a higher cost. The polder land can be used for very useful things in farming and human population in the Netherlands.

The new reclaiming of the polder land from mother nature can also stop mother nature from reclaiming it. According to the text, "with a system to reclaim land, flooding is less likely to happen." This shows that with the reclaiming the polder land project, it can protect them from seasonal flooding this can help the coastline communities not worry about these natural problems. The text also states, "The dams, canals, and ditches help the Dutch control flooding." These structures that would help reclaim the land could also help the Dutch control flooding so it can be less of a problem. The polder project can stop the land of the Netherlands from seasonal flooding or any water like problem.

Even though there can be downsides to this project like destroying the land of another ecosystem, it's best to do this so we reduce having a dense population.

This project can help the Dutch to have more farming land, create more living space, and prevent natural problems. I know this project will give a much bigger advantage to the population and economy of the Netherlands.

Sample 3 Annotation – Score Point 3

Score Point 3 – Meets Expectations: A complete argument that develops and supports claims with sufficient text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response:

- “I know that taking the polder land will benefit more than it will hurt. This is due to it allowing conveniences to the dutch population and reducing nautural problems.”

Uses an organizational structure appropriate to the purpose and task.

- There is a clear introduction, followed by a logically organized body with reasons and elaborations that support the argument.
- The inclusion of an alternative perspective enhances the organizational structure.
- These ideas lead the reader to the conclusion.

Uses varied transitional words and phrases to connect ideas and develop the argument:

- “This is due. . .This shows. . .Next. . .But can’t. . .According to. . .The text also states. . . Even though. . .”

Provides a concluding section that supports the argument by reiterating the specific advantages of reclaiming polder land and relating those to the “population and economy”:

- “This project can help the dutch to have more farming land, create more living space, and prevent natural problems. I know this project will give a much bigger atvantage to the population and economy of the netherlands.”

DEVELOPMENT

Uses logical reasoning supported by facts and/or data as evidence from the text(s).

- The writer uses quoted and paraphrased text as support for their reasons:
 - Reason: “The convieniance of the polder land is due to it allowing rich farm soil and more living space.”
 - ▶ Text support: “Polder land. . .some of the healthiest farmland. . .rich soil. . .farming crops tulips. . .”
 - ▶ Text support: “provides space for people to live. . .spreding out the dense population. . .”
 - Reason: “The new reclaiming of the polder land from mother nature can also stop mother nature from reclaiming it.”
 - ▶ Text support: “flooding is less likely. . .protect them from seasonal flooding. . . dams, canals, and ditches help the Dutch control flodding.”

Includes elaboration of thoughts that may consist of original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument.

- For each reason, there is elaboration that combines original thinking with text details:
 - “. . . rich soil that we can use to our advantage for farming crops and even our famous tulips.”
 - “But can’t we build bigger buildings? Yes, but that will require more resources thus leading to a higher cost.”
 - “. . . help the coastline communities not worry about these natural problems. . . it can be less of a problem. The polder project can stop the land of the Netherlands from seasonal flooding or any water like problem.”

Acknowledges an alternative perspective and refutes it:

- “Some claim that it is unhealthy for the environment while others claim it’s helpful for human life and the growing population.”
- “But can’t we build bigger buildings? Yes, but that will require more resources thus leading to a higher cost.”
- “Even though there can be downsides to this project like destroying the land of another ecosystem, it’s best to do this so we reduce having a dense population.”

LANGUAGE

Uses precise language to inform and explain about the task:

- “unhealthy,” “benefits,” “conveniences,” “advantage,” “dense population,” “resources,” “mother nature,” “coastal communities”

Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the development of ideas:

- “But can’t we build bigger buildings? Yes, but that will require more resources thus leading to a higher cost. The polder land can be used for very useful things in farming and human population in the Netherlands.”

Has a few minor errors in grammar usage and conventions with no significant effect on readability.

- The writer neglects to capitalize “dutch” and “netherlands” and has some spelling and usage errors:
 - “environment,” “flooding,” “problems,” “conveniences,” “natural,” “According,” “advantage,” “communities,” “farming”
 - “weather” for whether, “out” for on
- There is also a run together sentence, which is missing a period between “seasonal flooding” and “this can”:
 - “This shows that with the reclaiming the polder land project, it can protect them from seasonal flooding this can help the coastline communities not worry about these natural problems.”

Score Justification

- The claim is clear, and the focus is sustained throughout the response.
- The response creates clear connections between reasons and the task.
- Elaboration consists of mostly text-based evidence with some original thinking.
- The alternative perspective is acknowledged and briefly refuted.
- There is some precise language.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Use more original thinking for elaboration and integrate it with text examples.
- Develop the alternative perspective by providing some reasoning as to why it's a good idea, and then refute it with elaboration using original thinking and text support.
- Use a variety of compound and complex sentences.
- Use more precise vocabulary to enhance the response.
- Improve spelling of basic words.

Sample 4 Student Response – Score Point 3

In the story, “The Netherlands: Leave Nature Alone”, I think that the Dutch people should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land.

First, the Dutch should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land because “The ocean might look one big body of water, but it is not. It is made of many different kinds of ecosystems.” This could mean that many animals or sea creatures could die because the Dutch is bringing water out into the ocean and reclaiming more and more land because of what they build. Also, what if there is only one type of plant or food that a certain type of animal eats that is close to the Netherlands and the Dutch just scoop it out with their windmills and then the animal’s plant or food is gone. Then that animal could die out and go extinct. Then that will be all of the Dutchs fault.

Next, the Dutch should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land because “The Dutch have built impressive engineering projects to gain land. These projects, however, are not fail-proof. The walls and dams can break if too much pressure is put on them.” If any bad weather comes and the ocean creates huge waves, then the Dutch might think that they are safe because of the wall or dam, but to me, I don’t think so. Those walls might be strong but over time nature is going to damage it. That wall or dam could break and fall on the Dutch people and many houses will be very damaged and some of the people could also be severly hurt. Also if the wall or dam breaks and falls over then the water will be crashing in and most or even all of the land is going to be flooded and under water.

Lastly, the Dutch should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land because It will be safer for their people if they stop.

Sample 4 Annotation – Score Point 3

Score Point 3 – Meets Expectations: A complete argument that develops and supports claims with sufficient text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Introduces a claim and maintains focus on the claim throughout the response:

- “I think that the Dutch people should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land.”

Uses an organizational structure appropriate to the purpose and task.

- Supporting ideas are introduced with quotes from the text instead of topic sentences, but each idea is elaborated on with reasoning that clarifies the negative effects of reclaiming polder land.

Uses varied transitional words and phrases to connect ideas and develop the argument:

- “First. . . This could mean. . . Also, what if. . . Then that animal. . . Then that will be all. . .”
- “Next. . . If any bad weather. . . Also if the wall. . . Lastly. . .”

Provides a concluding statement that supports the argument:

- “Lastly, the Dutch should not reclaim any land from the ocean and turn it into podler land because It will be safer for their people if they stop.”

DEVELOPMENT

Uses logical reasoning supported by facts and/or data as evidence from the text(s):

- Reason: “. . . many animals or sea creatures could die because the Dutch is bringing water out into the ocean and reclaiming more and more land because of what they build.”
 - Text support: “The ocean might look one big body of water, but it is not. It is made of many different kinds of ecosystems.”
 - Text support: “If any bad weather comes and the ocean creates huge waves, then the Dutch might think that they are safe because of the wall or dam, but to me, I don’t think so. Those walls might be strong but over time nature is going to damage it.”
 - Text support: “The Dutch have built impressive engineering projects to gain land. These projects, however, are not fail-proof. The walls and dams can break if too much pressure is put on them.”

Includes elaboration of thoughts that may consist of original thinking combined with summary, paraphrasing, and/or text evidence to support the argument:

- “Also, what if there is only one type of plant or food that a certain type of animal eats that is close to the Netherlands and the Dutch just scoop it out with their windmills and then the animal’s plant or food is gone. Then that animal could die out and go extinct. Then that will be all of the Dutchs fault.”
- “That wall or dam could break and fall on the Dutch people and many houses will be very damaged and some of the people could also be severely hurt. Also if the wall or dam breaks and falls over then the water will be crashing in and most or even all of the land is going to be flooded and under water.”

Acknowledges an alternative perspective:

- “. . .the Dutch might think that they are safe because of the wall or dam. . .”

LANGUAGE

Uses some precise language to inform and explain about the task:

- “sea creatures,” “scoop,” “extinct,” “over time,” “damaged,” “severly,” “crashing in”

Uses varied sentence types and phrases to contribute to the development of ideas:

- “If any bad weather comes and the ocean creates huge waves, then the Dutch might think that they are safe because of the wall or dam, but to me, I don’t think so.”
- “Those walls might be strong but over time nature is going to damage it.”

Has a few minor errors in grammar usage and conventions with no significant effect on readability.

- There are some spelling errors, a missing apostrophe, and a usage error:
 - “podler,” “projests,” “severly”
 - “Dutchs”
 - “is” for are

Score Justification

- The organizational structure is appropriate and focus on the claim is maintained throughout the response.
- Transitions create connections between ideas and help to lead the reader through the argument.
- Adequate elaboration includes text evidence, paraphrased text ideas, and original thought.

Suggestions for Improvement

- For organization, make clearer connections to the claim throughout the response, thereby helping to persuade the reader of the validity of the argument.
- For development, include more text-based evidence and original thinking to support ideas.
- Use more precise language and sentence variety.

Sample 5 Student Response – Score Point 2

In these passages the authors ask if they should move or not move onto the polder land. After analyzing we should not build on polder land.

The first reason is it use to be sea floor. Moving animals out of there habitat can cause disruption in there life. "emptying the water from portions of the sea may distupt lives of the organisms that live there, resulting in the loss of plant and animal species." This shows why we should not cliam the land.

The second reason is after a while the walls can decay. if the walls ddecay ot would be a risk to the dutch for losing lots of homes and busnisses. "The dutch would lose all the land they tried to gian." This proves they should not reclaim polder land.

The third reason is the walls are very expensive to maintian. sea water can rise and walls can decay cause dutch people to have to repara the walls. "Money used to maintain the walls can be used for more worth while purposes." This proves we should not recliam polder land.

In conclusion we should not reclaim polder land because. The displacing of sea life, the risk and the price to maintian.

Sample 5 Annotation – Score Point 2

Score Point 2 – Approaches Expectations: An incomplete argument that partially supports claims with loosely related text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Introduces a claim that may be unclear or loosely related to the task:

- “. . .we should not build on polder land.”

Inconsistently maintains focus on the claim throughout the response.

Uses a weak or ineffective organizational structure that does not develop the argument.

- The response is formulaic, with each paragraph beginning with paraphrased text, followed by the related text quote. Instead of providing elaboration, the writer simply repeats the claim as the concluding statement.

Uses transitions to inconsistently connect ideas.

- The writer attempts to use transitions to introduce a new idea, but these transitions do not clarify how the writer thinks the ideas are related to each other or to the claim:
 - “The first reason. . .This shows. . .The second reason. . .This proves. . .The third reason. . .In conclusion. . .”

Provides a concluding statement that is simplistic and ineffective.

- The conclusion is simplistic, restating the claim and then listing the supporting ideas presented in the response. It is ineffective at persuading the reader:
 - “. . .we should not reclaim polder land because. The displacing of sea life, the risk and the price to maintain.”

DEVELOPMENT

Partially develops the argument using facts and/or evidence.

- The response uses text quotes as support and paraphrases those text quotes, rather than providing further text details:
 - Reason: “. . .it use to be sea floor. Moving animals out of there habitiat can cause disruption in there life.”
 - ▶ Text support: “emptying the water from portions of the sea may distupt lives of the organisms that live there, resulting in the loss of plant and animal species.”
 - Reason: “. . .while the walls can decay. if the walls ddecay ot would be a risk to the dutch for losing lots of homes and busnissess.”
 - ▶ Text support: “The dutch would lose all the land they tried to gian.”
 - Reason: “. . .the walls are very expensive to maintian. sea water can rise and walls can decay cause dutch people to have to repara the walls.”
 - ▶ Text support: “Money used to maintain the walls can be used for more worth while purposes.”

Minimally elaborates on thoughts, and may rely too heavily on the text.

- The attempts at elaboration are repetitive, merely restating the ideas in the text quotes, rather than providing some original thinking or reasoning.
- In the second body paragraph, the writer associates the ideas of decay and loss taken from the end of the second passage, but there is no explanation to tie these ideas to the writer's claim:
 - "if the walls ddecay ot would be a risk to the dutch for losing lots of homes and busnisses. 'The dutch would lose all the land they tried to gian.'"

There is a weak acknowledgment of an alternative perspective at the beginning of the response:

- ". . .the authors ask if they should move or not move onto the polder land."

LANGUAGE**Uses vocabulary and word choice that is limited or inconsistent to inform and explain about the task.**

- The writer correctly uses some vocabulary from the passage, as well as includes some original word choice, but much of the vocabulary is repetitive and basic:
 - "habitiat," "disruption," "decay," "maintain," "displacing"

Uses varied sentence types and phrases ineffectively:

- "if the walls ddecay ot would be a risk to the dutch for losing lots of homes and busnisses."

Has frequent errors in grammar usage and conventions that sometimes interfere with readability.

- There is missing capitalization at the beginning of some sentences, and "dutch" is not capitalized.
- There are missing commas, and in the conclusion, an incorrectly used period.
- There are also errors in spelling and in usage:
 - "analizing," "biuld," "habitiat," "there," "cliam," "ddecay," "ot," "busnisses," "gian," "maintian," "repare," "worth while," "recliam"
 - "use" for used, "cause" for causing

Score Justification

- This formulaic response organizes some reasons in support of the claim.
- The argument is not adequately developed.
- Simplistic transitions connect sentences and paragraphs, but do not show the connections between ideas.
- The elaboration is repetitive and reiterates ideas from the text. The response lacks original thinking.

Suggestions for Improvement

- To develop the argument, topic sentences should have original student ideas, not paraphrased text.

- Body paragraphs should end with a concluding sentence that explains why the preceding information supports the claim.
- Transitions should clarify for the reader how ideas are connected to each other and to the claim.
- Elaboration needs to include more original thought to show why the writer thinks the facts presented are persuasive.

Sample 6 Student Response – Score Point 2

Should the Netherlands reclaim land from the sea? No, they should not! Doing this is harmful to the ocean life, and a risk for the Dutch.

Many people think this is benefieting, but your actually taking away from sealife and the organisms that live in the ocean. You are also wasting lots of money on the walls and canals by needing to constantly make them higher, rebuidling them, and maintain them. Instead, we could be using this money to expand apartment buildings.

Many people need to also realize these walls and canals could break at any moment, the passage states “Then the Dutch would lose all the land that they had tried to gain.” As a community we should come together and think about the harmful risk we are putting ourselves through and also the wildlife through.

So I say we let the sea settle back into its original place, and we use the money for more beneficial purposes.

Sample 6 Annotation – Score Point 2

Score Point 2 – Approaches Expectations: An incomplete argument that partially supports claims with loosely related text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Introduces a claim that may be unclear or loosely related to the task.

- The introduction engages the reader and introduces the claim with a rhetorical question:
 - “Should the Netherlands reclaim land from the sea? No, they should not!”

Inconsistently maintains focus on the claim throughout the response.

Uses a weak or ineffective organizational structure that does not develop the argument.

- The introduction presents the reasons as “harmful to the ocean life, and a risk for the Dutch.”
- The first body paragraph begins by stating the harm to sea life, but immediately introduces a new idea, the cost of building walls.
- The second body paragraph addresses the idea of risk. It’s unclear whether this paragraph was meant to introduce a new idea or whether it serves as elaboration for the first body paragraph.

Uses transitions to inconsistently connect ideas:

- “Instead. . .As a community. . .So. . .”

Provides a vague concluding statement that confirms the position taken by the writer:

- “So I say we let the sea settle back into its original place, and we use the money for more beneficial purposes.”

DEVELOPMENT

Partially develops the argument using facts and/or evidence.

- The reasons given are related to ideas in the text, but are vague and lacking in text support.
- Only the last idea is supported with a text quote:
 - Reason: “. . .but your actually taking away from sealife and the organisms that live in the ocean.”
 - Reason: “You are also wasting lots of money on the walls and canals by needing to constantly make them higher, rebuilding them, and maintain them.”
 - Reason: “. . .these walls and canals could break at any moment . . .”
 - ▶ Text support: “Then the Dutch would lose all the land that they had tried to gain.”

Minimally elaborates on thoughts.

- The response lacks text details to clarify the context of the response.
- There is also no explanation to help the reader understand how the sea life will be harmed and why the walls are needed.
- There is some elaboration for the idea of wasting money:
 - “Instead, we could be using this money to expand apartment buildings.”

Weakly acknowledges an alternative perspective, with a vague allusion to the “many people” who might think differently:

- “Many people think this is benefiting. . .”
- “Many people need to also realize these walls and canals could break at any moment. . .”

LANGUAGE

Uses vocabulary and word choice that is limited or inconsistent to inform and explain about the task. Some precise language is used:

- “come together,” “harmful risk,” “settle back into its original place,” “beneficial purposes”

Uses varied sentence types and phrases ineffectively.

- The use of some sentence variety allows the reader to hear the voice of the writer:
 - “As a community we should come together and think about the harmful risk we are putting ourselves through and also the wildlife through. So I say we let the sea settle back into its original place, and we use the money for more beneficial purposes.”

Has a few minor errors in grammar usage and conventions with no significant effect on readability.

- There are some spelling and usage errors:
 - “benefieting,” “sealife,” “rebuidling”
 - “your” for you’re, “maintain” for maintaining

Score Justification

- The response presents some reasons to support the claim.
- There is little attempt to organize ideas.
- The response is vague, lacking text support to explain the context of the response.
- The elaboration includes some quoted text and some original thought.
- Some precise word choice, along with sentence variety, enhances the response.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Organize supporting reasons in the body of the response.
- Use transitions to show the reader how these reasons are connected to other ideas.
- Elaboration needs to include more text evidence as support for ideas, as well as more original thinking.

Sample 7 Student Response – Score Point 1

The Netherlands shouldn't reclaim land and make it Polder land because in The Netherlands: Leave Nature Alone in sentence 3 it says "They built engineering projects like walls and canals to block off areas of the North Sea". All of the engineering stuff is bad for the land and the water. Doing all of that can make all the food you plant go bad really fast and make your water undrinkable. They must have a reason for having such little land and then all of a sudden they want more land. That's why they shouldn't get it.

Sample 7 Annotation – Score Point 1

Score Point 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations: A weak attempt to write an argument that does not support claims with adequate text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Makes a claim that may be unclear or demonstrates a lack of awareness of the task.

- The writer takes a position:
 - “The Netherlands shouldn’t reclaim land. . .”

Demonstrates little to no organizational structure.

- The body of the response is a list of related ideas. The order of the sentences could be rearranged without changing the meaning of the response.

Transitions may be missing or confusing:

- “Doing all of that. . . That’s why. . .”

Concluding statement or section may be missing or unrelated to the topic.

- There is a vague concluding statement which reiterates the writer’s opposition to reclaiming land:
 - “That’s why they shouldn’t get it.”

DEVELOPMENT

Evidence from the text may be missing or confusing:

- “They built engineering projects like walls and canals to block off areas of the North Sea.”

Elaboration of thoughts may consist of vague or confusing ideas.

- There is no explanation to clarify for the reader why the engineering project is a bad idea or how it will ruin the food and water:
 - “All of the engineering stuff is bad for the land and the water. Doing all of that can make all the food you plant go bad really fast and make your water undrinkable.”

A new idea is introduced without explanation as to why it is important or connected to the claim:

- “They must have a reason for having such little land and then all of a sudden they want more land.”

LANGUAGE

Vocabulary and word choice may be unclear or confusing:

- “. . .engineering stuff is bad for the land and the water. . .”

Has a few minor errors in grammar usage and conventions with no significant effect on readability.

- There are some spelling errors:
 - “hsve,” “suddon”

Score Justification

- The response takes a position.
- There is little organizational structure in the body of the response.
- The response lacks transitions to show how ideas are connected.
- There is little support given to persuade the reader of the validity of the claim.
- The elaboration is vague and confusing.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Organize supporting reasons in the body of the response.
- Use transitions to connect ideas so that the reader knows how those ideas are related to the claim.
- Support ideas with more text evidence and explain how that evidence supports the claim.

Sample 8 Student Response – Score Point 1

The Nether Lands should be Polder Land so more people can like live there, Becuase one day we are going to lose room on the earth, And there would be a lot of fish in the water meaning more food, They can build better walls to keep the seawater out of the city/town, And it has the most heathiest plants that you cant find almost any whereon the map, Its good farm land to make the "Heathiest plants", So I say we shoud turn the Nether Lands in to Polder Land/State.

Sample 8 Annotation – Score Point 1

Score Point 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations: A weak attempt to write an argument that does not support claims with adequate text-based evidence.

STRUCTURE

Makes a claim that may be unclear or demonstrates a lack of awareness of the task:

- “The Nether Lands should be Polder Land so more people can like live there. . .”

Demonstrates little to no organizational structure.

- The body of the response is a list of statements related to the claim.
- There is no attempt to organize ideas, and the order of these reasons could be rearranged without changing the meaning of the response:
 - “. . .so more people can like live there. . .”
 - “. . .there would be a lot of fish. . .”
 - “. . .They can build better walls. . .”
 - “. . .Its good farm land. . .”

Transitions may be missing or confusing.

- Some transitions are used in an attempt to connect ideas:
 - “Becuase. . .And. . .So. . .”

Concluding statement or section may be missing or unrelated to the topic.

- There is a concluding statement which reiterates the claim:
 - “. . .So I say we shoud turn the Nether Lands in to Polder Land/State.”

DEVELOPMENT

Evidence from the text may be missing or confusing:

- “. . .They can build better walls to keep the seawater out of the city/town. . .”
- “. . .Its good farm land to make the ‘Heathiest plants’. . .”

Elaboration of thoughts may consist of vague or confusing ideas:

- “. . .Becuase one day we are going to lose room on the earth. . .”
- “. . .And it has the most heathiest plants that you cant find almost any whereon the map. . .”
- There is also an incorrect inference based on passage information:
 - “. . .And there would be a lot of fish in the water meaning more food. . .”

LANGUAGE

Vocabulary and word choice may be unclear or confusing:

- “. . .people can like live there. . .lose room on the earth. . .”

Has frequent errors in grammar usage and conventions that significantly interfere with readability.

- The writer lacks control over sentence formation, as the response is a list of ideas punctuated with commas.
- There are some spelling errors and a missing apostrophe:
 - “Nether Lands,” “Becuase,” “any whereon,” “heathiest,” “farm land,” “shoud,” “in to”
 - “cant”

Score Justification

- The writer takes a position, but the claim is unclear as the writer does not clarify how the “Polder Land” is created or why it gives the country more living space.
- The response is a list of ideas related to the claim.
- The response lacks organization.
- There are few transitions to connect ideas.
- The elaboration is vague and confusing.

Suggestions for Improvement

- State the claim more clearly and associate the idea of polder land with the idea of reclaiming land from the sea.
- Organize supporting reasons in the body of the response.
- Use transitions to connect ideas so that the reader knows how one idea is connected to another.
- Support ideas with further elaboration, including more text details and explanation.

Sample 9 Student Response – Score Point 0

i dont think that he should he does not seem like he wants to. you should never do something you dont like i dont belive you should do anything you dont like do so if he does not want to then he does not have to. The dutch should stop claming the ocean and it is bad for there people so there for they should stop donig it that is just my thought

Score Justification

The response is too limited to score. The response states a claim that is paraphrased from the last paragraph of the passage “The dutch should stop claming the ocean.” There are vague statements that offer the perspective that someone shouldn’t have to do something “if he does not want to” and an attempt to elaborate “it is bad for there people,” but this conclusion is not supported with text details or explanation to persuade the reader why the claim is valid. To obtain a score 1, the response needs a clearer claim, text support to show the reader that “claming the ocean” is a bad idea, and an explanation to clarify why someone might not want to do it.

Sample 10 Student Response – Score Point 0

while in the first passage the narrator describes it as “wonderful, beautiful, & calm” the other one describes it as “dangerous, unpredictable, & scary”, this is showing how people have different opinions from just seeing it & living it

Score Justification

The response is too limited to score. The claim is confusing “people have different opinions,” and the response lists adjectives from each of the passages, without identifying what they are describing. The reader is never told how these adjectives apply to “just seeing it & living it.” The lack of explanation forces the reader to realize that the first group of words expresses a positive perspective towards something, while the second group of words expresses a negative point of view. To obtain a score 1, the writer needs to clarify the context of the response by providing some text details. The response also needs to explain what these adjectives are describing and how that relates to the task.