

Annotations for National Park Responses

A7

Response 1:

Org/Purpose Score: 2-

The response is somewhat sustained [organizes enough detail to be eligible for a '2'] and provides rudimentary transitions [First, Also, Lastly] with little variety. The writer moves relatively quickly from idea to idea leaving little opportunity to provide tighter, stronger idea to idea connection. The claim is somewhat general [Well, there's a lot wrong with it] and is followed by a list-like construction of ideas. The response has clear beginning, middle and end but fails to acknowledge the opposing or alternate arguments or claims, representing, in total, work that just reaches the '2' level.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 2-

The response provides several reasons detailing the dire straits of parks but it fails to move beyond the level of bare reasons [damage the parks] with single extensions [the park has to pay for the damages], creating little in the way of sustained elaboration- a highlight response. Some evidence from sources is weakly attributed [as the article says] but it remains at the general level [invasive species are causing a lot of issues]. More specificity and depth of elaboration and stronger citation and attribution of relevant source material would be required for a higher score.

Conventions Score: 2:

Despite a few errors in spelling [alot, oversea] and comma commission, the response indicates an adequate command of conventions when density, severity and variety are considered.

A2

Response 2:

Org/Purpose Score: 4

The writer begins with an effective opening that demonstrates command of the core issues involved with loving parks too much [sense of naturedisrupted by the constant flow of noisy campers], while also stating a clear claim [The preservation and protection of the national parks can be put in harms way...] and previewing major points. As evidence is provided for the claim in this fully sustained piece, the writer uses a variety of transitional strategies including pronoun reference [This forces children....], logical interrelation of ideas in section on pollution, and syntactic variety [If the National Park service does promote tourism, attendance will grow even more, making national parks just as overpopulated as anywhere else in human society, as Mr. Arnot writes about his trip to the Grand Canyon] to tie the arguments together with strong idea to idea connections, helping create a sense of unity and completeness. The effective rebuttal of the idea that some parks have few visitors [Some might argue...] is logically placed and organically connected to the section on environmental harm [national parks already overflowing with campers will completely be overrun by humans, therefore destroying nature], demonstrating strong command of the complexity of this issue . Body paragraphs feature effective topic sentences and the writer consistently takes care to move the reader smoothly from idea to idea. The claim is strongly maintained throughout with appropriate attention to audience and purpose, and the writer moves the reader through the complex argument with a clear, effective and logical progression of ideas from beginning to end.

Evidence/ Elaboration Score: 4

The writer's claim that parks will be harmed by the promotion of tourism is fleshed out with detailed and well developed reasoned analysis that reflects a comprehensive understanding of the complexity of the issues facing the parks. The first section on the need for parks to be a refuge of tranquility is strengthened by precise word choice [rush of other people, sandwiched] , and relevant and specific citation and clear attribution [as President Nixon says...; as Mr Arnot writes] of source material [making national parks just as overpopulated as anywhere else in the human society] , as well as cause and effect reasoning that connects ideas and builds depth of elaboration. The next section centered on helping children take a break from technology is also marked by effective use of casual linking to connect ideas both from source material and through logical reasoning to provide solid evidence that student need to 'unplug.' Though

there is some lack of precision here [instead of repelling it], this is overwhelmed by the predominately effective detail and word choice provided throughout the response. The multifaceted final body paragraph adds significantly to the support/evidence by exploring multiple ways increased visitors can harm parks [pollution, physical destruction], concluding with an elaborated rebuttal of a counter argument that adds support. With comprehensive, integrated and relevant source material cited throughout and aided by consistently effective vocabulary/word choice appropriate to purpose and the careful building of depth throughout, the writer crafts an argument with thorough support/evidence whose overall effect is convincing.

Conventions Score: 2

Very few errors in [untamed gets in the habit] appear in this lengthy response, indicating an adequate command of conventions, especially considering that this is a first draft effort.

Response 3

Organization/Purpose Score: 1

The writer's simplistic claim [NPS should allow tourism] fails to address the complexity of the issues facing the parks. However, a few details are provided that are clearly connected to the claim, but they could be reordered without damaging meaning, indicating a somewhat random ordering of ideas. In addition, the response is too brief to be eligible for a higher score.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 1

Few, details, all vague to general [make money, see park, see what there is in nature] and no real attempt to build and connect ideas indicate support that is minimal with little or no connection to source material.

Conventions Score 2-:

The few errors in this brief response [is great, 'there' for their, That's] make this a lower '2', but, overall, it still represents an adequate command of conventions

A3

Response 4

Organization/Purpose Score: 4-

The introduction, strengthened by effective syntactic variety [Or at least they used to be], clearly describes the plight of our parks [the more popular parks are becoming more like theme parks!], underscoring the writer's understanding of the complexity of the issue. The claim [charge a small entrance fee, just enough to restore and maintain the parks] is followed by several sections that logically describe the problems facing both the overused and underused parks. The writer then clearly describes why charging the proper admission fee [not such a big amount that it will drive people away] is the only solution that addresses the full complexity of the problems facing the parks [the underused parks need more funds for operations rather than restoration]. The strong logic and well woven evidence that supports the inductively delivered claim creates a smooth and logical progression of ideas from beginning to end. The remainder of the response delineates and rebuts several objections from the opposing view that spring logically from the preceding text and which are strengthened by tight causal linking . Syntactic variety and sophistication, along with other transitional strategies [asking and answering rhetorical questions, pronoun reference], result in tight idea to idea connection through these sections as well [Well, if they really love nature, or if they want someone else to grow to love it, they won't mind paying that small amount of money. As for the people who don't want to pay, well they are probably the kind who would mess up the area anyway]. The conclusion wraps up the argument succinctly while repeating the claim that charging a proper fee is the proper path to restoring the parks to their former glory. Overall the fully sustained, unified response has a clear and effective organizational structure, pulled forward by the writer's strong focus and ability to connect ideas seamlessly. The writer lets the force of the argument, the ideas, shape the structure [form show always follow function], and the result is a unified, smoothly flowing response marked by careful attention to audience and purpose.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 3+

Strengths of this response include the strong ability to conceptualize and integrate material from multiple sources, demonstrating command of the complexity of the issue. However, the

reference to pollution in the second paragraph stops short of providing more detailed evidence that is clearly available [damage lungs and immune system, decrease ability of plants to produce and store food] that would have provided greater depth and specificity and ultimately more convincing, thorough support. As the response continues, the writer marshals relevant evidence to support the claim that the solution lies in charging sufficient fees to restore and maintain the parks, with much of this support coming in the form of insightful, well-reasoned and elaborated rebuttals that build and connect ideas, providing some depth. While considered a higher 3, the response would need more comprehensive use of source material to move to a higher score.

Conventions Score 2:

This response indicates a strong, not just adequate, command of conventions, especially given the on demand nature of the assignment.

A5

Response 5

Organization/Purpose Score: 2

The writer's claim is somewhat unclear as the focus appears to shift between global problems of environmental destruction and problems specifically associated with degradation of national parks, affected the overall progression of ideas and coherence of the response. This dual focus is evident in the second paragraph which moves quickly from campsites and litter to building malls and reusing materials with little transition to help the reader understand the writer's intent. While there is some cohesion created through cause and effect reasoning through this section, there are mighty leaps made between litter at campsites and extinction of species in the ocean which remain unexplained. While the final section comes back to a specific problem facing national parks, it relies on summary but does provide some idea to idea connection, with one glaring interruption [Invasive species are becoming more common] that impairs the logical flow of ideas. Though adequately sustained for a higher score, when all the strengths and weaknesses [including no reference to opposing arguments] are considered and balanced, the response indicates an inconsistent organizational structure with evident flaws.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 2

Cursory and uneven support describes well the overall effect of this attempt to develop an unclear, shifting focus. Much of the elaboration and detail remains at the general, vague level [losing the beauty], but ideas often do not clearly build and connect. For example, how exactly does litter at a campsite result in the extinction of a species in the ocean? It could happen, but the writer does not make a case for this based on reasoned analysis or evidence from text. Stronger more effective use of relevant source material in the second body paragraph would contribute to a higher score, though the writer does provide more solid support in the final section on invasive species due to cause and effect reasoning [To help the problem...However, this leads to...]. In total, greater precision in the use of source material and a clearer connection of details to the writer's claim would be needed for a higher score though this response should be considered a higher '2'. Though accurate multi-trait scoring relies on looking at each strand discretely, a serious problem in focus/purpose often has implications for the scoring of Organization/Purpose and Evidence/Elaboration.

Conventions Score: 1

The variety and density of errors present, both major and minor include a number of spelling errors of commonly used words for grade 7 [there for their, losing ,near by, beuty, liter for litter, fire wood, tha] in addition to comma commission and missing words. These errors, when considered holistically indicate a partial command of conventions.

A10

Response 6

Organization/Purpose Score: 1

Though representing a clear attempt to respond, the response is hamstrung by a claim that is difficult if not impossible to determine. Is this response about the proliferation of parks or the loss of wildlife or something else [The more parks they make the less animals are going to leave because of all the people there]? Details lack clarity and ideas move quickly from one to the other without stopping to expand and build idea to idea connection. The response ends on a note that does nothing to clarify the claim [some reason why it is bad and why it is good]. The response has little or no discernible plan, and the response provides little or no focus, often leaving the reader wondering what the writer is attempting to say.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 1

This skeletal response provides little framework [unclear claim] upon which to place the few details cited. There is little use of source material, although there is mention of carving on trees, but this detail is not extended. Details often lack clarity [the more parks they make the less animals are going to leave because of all the people] or are vague [not good, kinda good] and vocabulary is limited.

Conventions Score: 1-

Given the brevity of the response, the density and severity of errors is such that the response sits close to the '0/1' line in Conventions. Errors in spelling [kinda, mant, environment] and usage [a environment] are present indicating a partial command of conventions.

A4

Response 7

Organization/Purpose Score: 3

The introduction provides a preview of major points as well as a clear claim [I deeply support the idea that national parks should promote tourism]. The topic sentences in the body paragraphs are wordy and not particularly effective [The first reason why I support the promotion of tourism is because national parks can increase the use of exercise], but the writer does demonstrate the ability to group like ideas. Within body paragraphs, there is adequate connection between ideas although the first section on exercise moves rather quickly. The subsequent body paragraphs link ideas through pronoun reference and logical interrelation of ideas [section on widening the pallet of young children] with some ideas being more loosely connected. The final paragraph serves to acknowledge and opposing argument and restate the main points while also including a new idea derived from the preceding text [the parks should welcome all citizens, not just a few environmentalists, clearing away all molecules of trash. Overall, the response has an evident structure and overall progression of ideas though there are some flaws and loosely related material. At times awkward, the language expression does not demonstrate the control, syntactic variety and fluency of a '4' response. A lower '3', this response compares well with paper A5 which received a '2' for Organization/Purpose, drawing a teachable difference on the '2/3' line.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 3

Overall, this response presents some reasoned analysis though much of the detail remains at the general level. Little depth of elaboration is present in the first section on as it moves quickly, but there is a list of causes of obesity. The final point here about 'lowering the cause of obesity' adds little to the detail as it remains unexplained. The section on entertainment includes clear attribution to relevant source material as does the final and best elaborated body paragraph [man from Little Rock] which provided some depth and specificity of elaboration [widen the pallet, crazy purple plant, virtually stay with you forever]. The final section that includes a somewhat elaborated rebuttal to an opposing argument [overuse could harm parks], rounds out the support that, in total, provides adequate support for the writer's claim.

Conventions Score: 0

The density, severity and variety of errors is such that little or no command of conventions is indicated. Multiple errors in multiple categories occur including misspelling of commonly used words [deaply, struggeling, obeasity, personaly, naturaly], failure to capitalize the first word in sentences, usage errors [caused to unhealthy meals], and comma splice and comma commission errors [parks, to help] are present and are easily recognized in a single, focused holistic reading.

Response 8

Organization/Purpose Score: 3

In the introduction, the writer's claim that the only path for correcting problems facing parks is through increased attendance and user fees begins to be fleshed out which continues into the second section on humankind's 'disruptive' nature. This section is tied together with adequate transitional strategies with some variety including pronoun reference [This has caused...], conditional statements [If we were somehow able...], however a better segue into the discussion of promoting attendance to increase dollars that closes this paragraph would smooth out the progression of ideas here. The next paragraph has a clear focus on how to use the increased revenue to improve parks, but it consists primarily of a single quotation from the source material, allowing little idea to idea connection to develop. The final paragraph encapsulated the problem again but adds that it is not too late to reverse the decline in parks. In total, there is adequate attention to audience and purpose, and the response displays a sense of unity and completeness and an overall progression of ideas from beginning to end, despite some flaws.

Evidence/Elaboration Score: 3

Wherever details that support the writer's claim are placed, they should be considered when scoring Evidence/Elaboration. The introduction serves to both announce the claim and begin to elaborate on the decline in our parks. That humans have become hazardous in general is followed by specific examples of abuse [carving, littering and tearing things up]. This line of analysis continues in the first body paragraph which is strengthened by a direct, pertinent, and clearly attributed quotation from the sources [We can't possibly cover all the costs...], although it is not clear how littering leads to animal extinction. The next section effectively cites the NPS on invasive species, but there is no writer analysis of the quote that expands on or adds to the discussion. Overall, considering all the weaknesses and strengths, there is adequate evidence from sources integrated into the writer's argument for a '3' and sufficient elaboration, though more comprehensive use of source materials and greater depth of elaboration would be required for a higher score. Comparing paper 2 to this response clearly demonstrates the difference between 'thorough and convincing support' at the '4' level and adequate support at the '3' level.

Conventions Score: 2

Other than a few minor errors in comma use, the response is clean, indicating a clearly adequate control of conventions.