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Today, we will focus on:

• Essential elements of an effective extended response
• Where you need to focus your instruction
• What you can learn about your student’s extended response
• How to use the electronic scoring tool
Begin with the Instructions

Instructions

Read
• On the page 2 tab above, you will read two texts presenting different views on the same topic.
• Both writers argue that their position on the issue is correct.

Plan
• Analyze the two texts to determine which writer presents the stronger case.
• Develop your own argument in which you explain how one position is better supported than the other.
• Include relevant and specific evidence from both sources to support your argument.

Write
• Type your response in the box on the right.
• Your response should be approximately 4 to 7 paragraphs of 3 to 7 sentences each.
• Remember to allow a few minutes to review and edit your response.

You have up to 45 minutes for reading, planning, writing, and editing your response.

• Analyze both passages
• Decide which argument has more convincing evidence
• Explain why the evidence supports your choice
Read and Analyze

Viewpoint 1

Taxation and Revenue Stimulus Material

Taxation and Revenue Stimulus Passage #1

Press Release from the Office of
U.S. Representative Melody Wallis
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC

Representative Wallis Announces Economic Boost for 12th District
July 17, 2013

Washington, DC – Representative Melody Wallis announced that Congress passed the highway and transit bill today.

"This bill funds the expansion of Highway 17 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane thoroughfare. It will positively affect the town of Oak Falls," Wallis said. As part of the expansion, Highway 17 will move two miles east of the town of Oak Falls. The bill will ease traffic congestion and create job opportunities during and after construction.

Last year, Representative Wallis held town hall meetings to gather opinions from her constituents about revitalizing the economy in the 12th District. Two years ago, Turnaround Motors and Bell Camera closed their factory doors. The result has been high unemployment with no immediate prospects for new businesses. Representative Wallis heard residents' concerns for jobs in the district.

Improving the highway means jobs for local construction workers. Once completed, the highway will bring more long-distance travelers into the area. Some officials anticipate a 30% increase in highway traffic due to the ease of traveling on the improved Highway 17. An increase in travelers will attract national motel and restaurant chains along the highway route. These national businesses will mean permanent jobs for residents.

In the future, historical features in Oak Falls and Gaston, such as brick streets built by early settlers and the old wheat mill, will likely become popular tourist attractions. More visitors will increase business for local shops and restaurants.

The improved highway will eliminate eighteen-wheeler traffic through towns, a major source of traffic congestion and noise. A 2001 study in Texas showed that bypasses reduce traffic through towns by as much as 75%. Eliminating eighteen-wheeler traffic will also reduce road maintenance costs. The improvement of Highway 17, funded by federal tax allocations, is an important investment in the area.

Viewpoint 2

Taxation and Revenue Stimulus Passage #2

Oak Falls Gazette
Letter to the Editor

I am a small business owner living in Representative Wallis's congressional district. A bill has been passed to expand Highway 17 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane thoroughfare. This change includes plans to move Highway 17 two miles to the east, which means it will now bypass our town completely. I find this unacceptable.

The Gazette reports that because Highway 17 runs through six states, construction will be paid for with federal road funds. That means some of our federal taxes will pay for a road that I believe will harm our town. I also believe that few residents of Oak Falls will use the road. Our town and district will lose money as a result of this highway bypass paid for by our tax dollars.

The road construction jobs are only a temporary bandage on the wound made by our two manufacturers closing their doors. Once the road construction is finished, only minimum wage jobs will remain.

In fact, the highway will bypass four cities in our district alone. Each of these towns will lose business because fewer travelers will pass through them and eat, stay overnight, or purchase gas. There is no guarantee that tourists will drive an extra two miles into our town if national chain motels and restaurants are built at the highway exits. The 2001 study Representation Wallis references does show that bypasses reduce traffic and noise in towns, but the study also shows they have a negative impact on local businesses.

If this project were paid for with state tax money alone, angry voters would have struck it down. Representative Wallis held town hall meetings to hear residents' opinions about the local economy, but obviously she did not listen to the concerns they voiced. Please consider local concerns about this federal project.

Taxation and Revenue Prompt

Analyze the arguments presented in the press release and the letter to the editor.

In your response, develop an argument in which you explain how one position is better supported than the other. Incorporate relevant and specific evidence from both sources to support your argument.

Remember, the better-argued position is not necessarily the position with which you agree. This task should take approximately 45 minutes to complete. Your response should contain 4 – 7 paragraphs of 3 to 7 sentences each, about 300 – 500 words.
# Continue with Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Truthful statements that cannot be denied. Statements that the average person may know, or which can be proven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics or Data</td>
<td>Numerical facts; can be presented in raw numbers, percentages, or fractions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples or Anecdotes</td>
<td>Real-life situations, events, or experiences that illustrate a position; anecdotal stories that help explain an author’s claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Testimony</td>
<td>The observations or conclusion of someone who is considered highly knowledgeable because he/she is an expert in a particular field of study or occupation; someone who has firsthand knowledge and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Reasoning</td>
<td>An explanation which draws conclusions that the reader can understand; a discussion which helps the reader understand or make sense out of facts or examples offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Appeal</td>
<td>Use of sympathy, fear, loyalty, etc. to persuade; manipulates the reader’s emotions – ethos, pathos, logos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identify the Evidence from Each Viewpoint

Strong Evidence

- Research or experts
- Reliable sources
- Relevant facts
- Logical conclusions

Weak Evidence

- Vague references
- Unnamed sources
- Irrelevant details
- Flawed reasoning
Analyze and Evaluate the Viewpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence that Supports</th>
<th>Evidence that Opposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question or statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which position is better supported?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision (Claim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons (Analysis/Evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, I will . . .

- List the evidence that supports
- List the evidence that opposes
- Evaluate the evidence
- Select the position that is better supported
### Analyze and Evaluate the Evidence

Now, I will . . .

- List the evidence that supports
- List the evidence that opposes
- Evaluate the evidence
- Select the position that is better supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence that Supports</th>
<th>Evidence that Opposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will ease traffic congestion</td>
<td>Will bypass town and harm it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will create jobs</td>
<td>Road paid for with federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving highway means jobs for construction workers</td>
<td>Few residents will use road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will bring more long-distance travelers to area</td>
<td>Will lose money because of bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% increase in traffic that won’t impact city roads</td>
<td>Construction jobs are only temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will attract national motel and restaurant chains</td>
<td>Minimum wage jobs will remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will eliminate truck traffic through city by as much as 75%</td>
<td>Highway will bypass four cities in one district, so fewer travelers will stop in the cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will reduce road maintenance costs</td>
<td>2001 study shows bypasses have negative impact on local businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative held town meetings</td>
<td>Representative did not listen to local concerns in her town meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which position regarding the building of a new road is better supported?
Remember, an Effective Claim

• Must be arguable but stated as a fact. It *must be debatable with inquiry and evidence; it is not a personal opinion or feeling.*
• A claim is supported by evidence.
• A claim defines your writing’s goals, direction, and scope.
• The best claims are focused, specific, complex, and relevant.
What’s the Starting Point?

The claim
- Is the roadmap with signs and markings
- Guides the writer and reader through the argument
- Provides the position taken
- Provides the reason “why”
Which One Provides the Best Roadmap?

I feel Jenkins has the better argument supported by common sense and enough data to win her argument.

Both the press release and the letter to the editor offer positions that are supported by both fact and opinion. The press release seeks to exhort the new bill for expansion of Highway 17, while the letter argues that the passing of the bill could prove detrimental to the district. While both sides make an acceptable case, the latter provides a stronger argument.
Tip 2: Give commentary on quotations.

Test-takers should

• Cite specific evidence (phrases and even complete sentences) from the passages that accompany the prompts.
• Express their own thoughts about their chosen evidence.
• Explain why the evidence they’ve chosen helps make the points they want to make.

Remember: Copied text contributes to a score only if the test-taker fully explains how that text illustrates a point he or she is making. Simply lifting information from the passages isn’t going to be enough to earn points because that’s someone else’s writing, not the test-taker’s.
Now the safety issue comes up again, in the yearly switch to and from DST. One study shows pedestrian fatalities from cars increased immediately after clocks were set back in the fall. Arguments continue with another study that shows 227 pedestrians were killed in the week following the end of DST compared with 65 pedestrians killed the week before DST ended. It is also stated that the adjustment period drivers endure each year is a dangerous time for pedestrians, and DST may be the reason. Instead of a gradual transition in the morning or afternoon by just minutes of sunlight each day, the immediate shift of one hour forward or backward fails to provide drives and pedestrians time to adjust. These opponents believe the consideration of cost and confusion are simply not worth all of the trouble. With everything there are pros and cons no matter what, so in the end we can only hope the good outweighs the bad.

Note: Text in red was copied directly from the source text.
The ER
Electronic Scoring Tool

Let’s Take a Quick Look!
ER Scoring Tool!

Extended Response Scoring Tool

The GED Ready® Practice Test for language arts gives students a chance to practice their writing skills by completing an Extended Response (ER) question. This tool is designed to help you score and provide meaningful feedback to your students about their written response, located in their GED Ready Score Report.

Although this tool is complementary to the GED Ready Practice Test, it can be used with other practice questions in your classroom!

How to use this tool

This tool guides you in scoring your student’s Extended Response based on three traits and provides feedback in a printable report.

1. Download the prompts and passages used in the GED Ready. As you read your student’s response, you should be able to determine which one they were given.
2. Enter your student’s name and test date (or date of response) to personalize their report.
3. For each trait, read your student’s response and select the skill descriptors that best describe the response (you will read the response at least three times).
4. View the feedback report and print it to review with your student.

https://app.ged.com/preLogin4?_ga=2.134815729.1873690640.1638749718-2140352129.1637081214#/essayScoring
How the Template Works

Trait 1: Creation of Arguments and Use of Evidence

Read your student's response, then choose the skill descriptor in each row that best describes their response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generates text-based argument(s) and establishes a purpose that is connected to the prompt</th>
<th>Score 0</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No clearly-stated claims or not applicable</td>
<td>At least one clearly-stated or strongly implied claim</td>
<td>Explicit and clearly stated claim or claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted claims are vague and/or illogical and/or not text-based or not applicable</td>
<td>At least one claim is logical and text-based. Additional claims may be tied to the larger issue rather being based on a close reading of the text</td>
<td>Claims are logical and based on a close reading of the text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted claims are vague and/or do not support an overall stance or not applicable</td>
<td>Implied or clearly-stated claims may support an overall stance, but the stance may be vague, unclear, or inconsistent</td>
<td>Explicit claims support a clear and consistent stance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Breaks down each dimension within a trait
- These dimensions are those that trained scorers may consider in scoring each of the three traits
Things to Keep in Mind

- Each test-taker receives three scores—one for each trait in the rubric.
- Although each trait is broken down into sub-dimensions, the trait score is determined holistically.
- When you use the resource guides and study the annotations, you’ll see offsets—high levels in some sub-dimensions balanced by lower levels in others.
Getting Down to the Nitty Gritty

Learn the process. Use the tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>generates text-based argument(s) and the prompt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cites relevant and specific evidence from (may include few irrelevant pieces of evidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the source texts (e.g., distinguishes between makes reasonable inferences about unidentifies fallacious reasoning, evaluates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>generates an argument and demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cites some evidence from source text(s) of relevant and irrelevant citations or a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partially analyzes the issue and/or evaluates within the source texts; may be simplified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>may attempt to create an argument OR prompt OR does neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cites minimal or no evidence from source from source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimally analyzes the issue and/or evaluates within the source texts; may completamente no understanding of the given argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Reads ARE Necessary

• When you review an extended response…you don’t read for organization, grammar, typos, and overall development of ideas simultaneously
• You must read at least once for each trait
• It becomes easier the more you practice
• The goal is to internalize the process and the characteristics of each trait.
Quality Reigns Supreme!

• Each trait score is determined by the *quality* of the writing

• A response that receives a score of 2 on Trait 1 (Creation of Arguments and Use of Evidence) may have a few elements that seem consistent with a 1-level response.

• Because the response is so strong in other elements, it can still receive an on-balance score of 2 for Trait 1.
Overview: The Three Traits

- **Trait 1: Creation of Arguments and the Use of Evidence**
- **Trait 2: Development of Ideas and Organizational Structure**
- **Trait 3: Clarity and Command of Standard English Conventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2     | - generates text-based argument(s) and establishes a purpose that is connected to the prompt  
       - cites relevant and specific evidence from source text(s) to support argument (may include few irrelevant pieces of evidence or unsupported claims)  
       - analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts (e.g., distinguishes between supported and unsupported claims, makes reasonable inferences about underlying premises or assumptions, identifies fallacious reasoning, evaluates the credibility of sources, etc.) |
| 1     | - generates an argument and demonstrates some connection to the prompt  
       - cites some evidence from source text(s) to support argument (may include a mix of relevant and irrelevant citations or a mix of textual and non-textual references)  
       - partially analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts; may be simplistic, limited, or inaccurate |
| 0     | - may attempt to create an argument OR lacks purpose or connection to the prompt OR does neither  
       - cites minimal or no evidence from source text(s) (sections of text may be copied from source)  
       - minimally analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts; may completely lack analysis or demonstrate minimal or no understanding of the given argument(s) |

**Non-scorable Responses (Score of 0/Condition Codes)**
- Response exclusively contains text copied from source text(s) or prompt  
- Response shows no evidence that test-taker has read the prompt or is off-topic  
- Response is incomprehensible  
- Response is not in English  
- Response has not been attempted (blank)
Why Focus on Trait 1?

• Is pivotal from a skills perspective
• Builds a solid foundation for cross-cutting skills
• Provides the basis for demonstrating Trait 2 (organization and development of ideas) and Trait 3 (standard English conventions)
Stimulus Material

Let’s Review!

Taxation and Revenue Stimulus Material

Taxation and Revenue Stimulus Passage #1

Press Release from the Office of U.S. Representative Melody Walle
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC

Representative Walle Announces Economic Boost for 12th District
July 17, 2013

Washington, DC – Representative Melody Walle announced that Congress passed the highway and transit bill today.

“The bill funds the expansion of Highway 17 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane thoroughfare. It will positively affect the town of Oak Falls,” Walle said. As part of the expansion, Highway 17 will move two miles east of the town of Oak Falls. The bill will ease traffic congestion and create job opportunities during and after construction.

Last year, Representative Walle held town hall meetings to gather opinions from her constituents about revitalizing the economy in the 12th District. Two years ago, Turnaround Motors and Bell Camera closed their factory doors. The result has been high unemployment with no immediate prospects for new businesses.

Representative Walle heard residents’ concerns for jobs in the district.

Improving the highway means jobs for local construction workers. Once completed, the highway will bring more long-distance travelers into the area. Some officials anticipate a 20% increase in highway traffic due to the ease of traveling on the improved Highway 17. An increase in travelers will attract national motel and restaurant chains along the highway route. These national businesses will mean permanent jobs for residents.

In the future, historical features in Oak Falls and Gaston, such as brick streets built by early settlers and the old wheat mill, will likely become popular tourist attractions. More visitors will increase business for local shops and restaurants.

The improved highway will eliminate eighteen-wheeler traffic through town, a major source of traffic congestion and noise. A 2001 study in Texas showed that bypasses reduce traffic through towns by as much as 75%. Eliminating eighteen-wheeler traffic will also reduce road maintenance costs.

The improvement of Highway 17, funded by federal tax allocations, is an important investment in the area.

Taxation and Revenue Passage #2

Oak Falls Gazette
Letter to the Editor

I am a small business owner living in Representative Walle’s congressional district. A bill has been passed to expand Highway 17 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane thoroughfare. This change includes plans to move Highway 17 two miles to the east, which means it will now bypass our town completely. I find this unacceptable.

The Gazette reports that because Highway 17 runs through six states, construction will be paid for with federal road funds. That means some of our federal taxes will pay for a road that I believe will harm our town. I also believe that few residents of Oak Falls will use the road. Our town and district will lose money as a result of this highway bypass paid for by our tax dollars.

Road construction jobs are only a temporary bandage on the wound made by our two manufacturers closing their doors. Once the road construction is finished, only minimum-wage jobs will remain.

In fact, the highway will bypass four cities in our district alone. Each of these towns will lose business because fewer travelers will pass through them and eat, stay overnight, or purchase gas. There is no guarantee that tourists will drive an extra two miles into our town if national chain motels and restaurants are built at the highway exits. The 2001 study Representative Walle references shows that bypasses reduce traffic and noise in towns, but the study also shows they have a negative impact on local businesses.

If this project were paid for with state tax money alone, angry voters would have-Protest it. Representative Walle held town hall meetings to hear residents’ opinions about the local economy, but obviously she did not listen to the concerns they voiced. Please consider local concerns about this federal project.

Taxation and Revenue Prompt

Analyze the arguments presented in the press release and the letter to the editor.

In your response, develop an argument in which you explain how one position is better supported than the other. Incorporate relevant and specific evidence from both sources to support your argument.

Remember, the better-argued position is not necessarily the position with which you agree. This task should take approximately 45 minutes to complete. Your response should contain 4—7 paragraphs of 3 to 7 sentences each, about 300—500 words.
## Trait 1

### Score | Description
--- | ---
**Trait 1: Creation of Arguments and Use of Evidence**

2  
- generates text-based argument(s) and establishes a purpose that is connected to the prompt
- cites relevant and specific evidence from source text(s) to support argument (may include few irrelevant pieces of evidence or unsupported claims)
- analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts (e.g., distinguishes between supported and unsupported claims, makes reasonable inferences about underlying premises or assumptions, identifies fallacious reasoning, evaluates the credibility of sources, etc.)

1  
- generates an argument and demonstrates some connection to the prompt
- cites some evidence from source text(s) to support argument (may include a mix of relevant and irrelevant citations or a mix of textual and non-textual references)
- partially analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts, may be simplistic, limited, or inaccurate

0  
- may attempt to create an argument OR lacks purpose or connection to the prompt OR does neither
- cites minimal or no evidence from source text(s) (sections of text may be copied from source)
- minimally analyzes the issue and/or evaluates the validity of the argumentation within the source texts; may completely lack analysis or demonstrate minimal or no understanding of the given argument(s)

### Non-scorable Responses (Score of 0/Condition Codes)
- Response exclusively contains text copied from source text(s) or prompt
- Response shows no evidence that test-taker has read the prompt or is off-topic
- Response is incomprehensible
- Response is not in English
- Response has not been attempted (blank)
Use the Scoring Tool
Trait 1
Let’s Get Started!

• Read the response for Trait 1
• Can you find the claim?
• Would you give it a score of 0, 1, or 2?
• Why?
• Find the evidence that the student used?
• Is the evidence strong or weak?

Response 4

We have 2 opposing viewpoints from Representative Walls and a citizen and business owner, Alice Jenkins, concerning using tax dollars to expand a highway from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.

I feel Jenkins has the better argument supported by common sense and enough data to win her the argument.

Walls held town meetings to discuss whether to expand a highway through her district and possibilities that this expansion would help the unemployment caused by 2 businesses closing down. Walls argues that the highway means jobs for construction and restaurants and motels and gas stations will pop up to make permanent jobs after the construction is complete. Does using tax payer dollars to build and expand a highway make up for 2 businesses being lost and jobs going with them?

As Jenkins points out, only minimum wage jobs will be available from the business that Walls describes will come to town. She argues these minimum wage jobs will not be enough to replace the jobs that left with the camera place and the auto place.

Too many times politicians think that minimum wage jobs are good jobs, which they are not. No one can live on minimum wage. Most would rather live on unemployment or move to another city with good jobs. The representative quotes a 2001 study that says that a bypass reduces traffic flow and congestion in towns by 75% which Jenkins agrees with but in the same study it says the bypass has a negative impact on local businesses.

Jenkins points out that if State money were used in the construction, the voters would have voted it down but since the federal government is involved, she feels the tax money could be used wise.

Jenkins correctly points out that this highway project is just a band aid on the scar left by the 2 businesses closing their doors.

Although the Walls is trying to bring some jobs to the community, it seems it is just a temporary fix and should concentrate on a better, more permanent solution.
Trait 2

Provide fully developed ideas
• Use a structure that is logical and conveys message and purpose of the response
• Maintain formal style
• Use words to express ideas clearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait 2: Development of Ideas and Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2     | • contains ideas that are well developed and generally logical; most ideas are elaborated upon  
       • contains a sensible progression of ideas with clear connections between details and main points  
       • establishes an organizational structure that conveys the message and purpose of the response; applies transitional devices appropriately  
       • establishes and maintains a formal style and appropriate tone that demonstrate awareness of the audience and purpose of the task  
       • chooses specific words to express ideas clearly |
| 1     | • contains ideas that are inconsistently developed and/or may reflect simplistic or vague reasoning; some ideas are elaborated upon  
       • demonstrates some evidence of a progression of ideas, but details may be disjointed or lacking connection to main ideas  
       • establishes an organization structure that may inconsistently group ideas or is partially effective at conveying the message of the task; uses transitional devices inconsistently  
       • may inconsistently maintain a formal style and appropriate tone to demonstrate an awareness of the audience and purpose of the task  
       • may occasionally misuse words and/or choose words that express ideas in vague terms |
| 0     | • contains ideas that are insufficiently or illogically developed, with minimal or no elaboration on main ideas  
       • contains an unclear or no progression of ideas; details may be absent or irrelevant to the main ideas  
       • establishes an ineffective or no discernable organizational structure; does not apply transitional devices, or does so inappropriately  
       • uses an informal style and/or inappropriate tone that demonstrates limited or no awareness of audience and purpose  
       • may frequently misuse words, overuse slang or express ideas in a vague or repetitious manner |

Non-scorable Responses (Score of 0/Condition Codes)
Response exclusively contains text copied from source text(s) or prompt
Response shows no evidence that test-taker has read the prompt or is off-topic
Response is incomprehensible
Response is not in English
Response has not been attempted (blank)
Use the Scoring Tool
Trait 2
Let’s Get Started!

- Access your second copy of the Sample Response
- Read the response again
- Let’s start with Trait 2

Response 4

{We have 2 opposing viewpoints from Representative Walls and a citizen and business owner, Alice Jenkins, concerning using tax dollars to expand a highway from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.}

{I feel Jenkins has the better argument supported by common sense and enough data to win her the argument.}

Walls held town meetings to discuss whether to expand a highway through her district and possibilities that this expansion would help the unemployment caused by 2 businesses closing down. Walls argues that the highway means jobs for construction and restaurants and motels and gas stations will pop up to make permanent jobs after the construction is complete. Does using tax payer dollars to build and expand a highway make up for 2 businesses being lost and jobs going with them?

As Jenkins points out, only minimum wage jobs will be available from the business that Walls describes will come to town. She argues these minimum wage jobs will not be enough to replace the jobs that left with the camera place and the auto place.

Too many times politicians think that minimum wage jobs are good jobs, which they are not. No one can live on minimum wage. Most would rather live on unemployment or move to another city with good jobs. The representative quotes a 2001 study that says that a bypass reduces traffic flow and congestion in towns by 75% which Jenkins agrees with but in the same study it says the bypass has a negative impact on local businesses.

{Jenkins points out that if State money were used in the construction, the voters would have voted it down but since the federal government is involved, she feels the tax money could be used wise.}

{Jenkins correctly points out that this highway project is just a band aid on the scar left by the 2 businesses closing their doors.}

{Although the Walls is trying to bring some jobs to the community, it seems it is just a temporary fix and should concentrate on a better, more permanent solution.}
Use varied sentence structure that provides a level of fluency in the response

Demonstrate competency of conventions

Limit errors in mechanics and usage by editing as needed
Use the Scoring Tool
Trait 3
Let’s Get Started!

- Access your third copy of the Sample Response
- Read the response again
- Let’s start with Trait 3

Response 4

We have 2 opposing viewpoints from Representative Walls and a citizen and business owner, Alice Jenkins, concerning using tax dollars to expand a highway from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.

I feel Jenkins has the better argument supported by common sense and enough data to win her the argument.

Walls held town meetings to discuss whether to expand a highway through her district and possibilities that this expansion would help the unemployment caused by 2 businesses closing down. Walls argues that the highway means jobs for construction and restaurants and motels and gas stations will pop up to make permanent jobs after the construction is complete. Does using tax payer dollars to build and expand a highway make up for 2 businesses being lost and jobs going with them?

As Jenkins points out, only minimum wage jobs will be available from the business that Walls describes will come to town. She argues these minimum wage jobs will not be enough to replace the jobs that left with the camera place and the auto place.

Too many times politicians think that minimum wage jobs are good jobs, which they are not. No one can live on minimum wage. Most would rather live on unemployment or move to another city with good jobs. The representative quotes a 2001 study that says that a bypass reduces traffic flow and congestion in town by 75% which Jenkins agrees with but in the same study it says the bypass has a negative impact on local businesses.

Jenkins points out that if State money were used in the construction, the voters would have voted it down but since the federal government is involved, she feels the tax money could be used wise.

Jenkins correctly points out that this highway project is just a band aid on the scar left by the 2 businesses closing their doors.

Although the Walls is trying to bring some jobs to the community, it seems it is just a temporary fix and should concentrate on a better, more permanent solution.
Where do we go from here?

*Take the report and plan!*
The Report is In!

### Trait 1: Creation of Arguments and Use of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one clearly-stated or strongly implied claim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one claim is logical and text-based. Additional claims may be tied to the larger issue rather than being based on a close reading of the text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implied or clearly-stated claims may support an overall stance, but the stance may be vague, unclear, or inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted claims are vague and/or lack explanation such that the criteria for analyzing the issue or evaluating the argument is unclear or not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance is connected to the writing task, though the response may occasionally wander off purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses some evidence from the source text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes off-topic information or is loosely connected to the source text or not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence from the source text generally supports the student's claims and stance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student provides commentary on the evidence chosen, but commentary is general, vague or weakly tied to the argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response partially or simplistically analyzes the issue in the source texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response does not evaluate the argumentation developed in the source texts or not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response presents limited or partially inaccurate analysis of the arguments in the source texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- Needs Improvement
- Satisfactory
- Desirable

---

1. **1**
2. **2**
3. **3**
4. **3**
The Report is In!

Trait 2: Development of Ideas and Organizational Structure

- Ideas are inconsistently or simplistically developed
- Ideas may reflect simplistic or vague reasoning
- Some (i.e. more than one) ideas may be elaborated on
  - Contains an unclear or no progression of ideas
  - Details may be irrelevant to the main idea or not applicable
  - Details may be disjointedly connected to each other or inconsistently used in service of the progression of ideas
- Establishes an organization structure
- May group ideas inconsistently or be only partially effective at conveying the message of the response
- Does not use or inappropriately uses transitional devices
  - Inconsistently uses a formal style
  - Inconsistently applies an appropriate tone
  - Demonstrates a general awareness of audience and purpose
- May occasionally misuse words
- May occasionally use slang but it does not overly detract from the overall message
- Some ideas may be expressed vaguely
### Trait 3: Clarity and Command of Standard English Conventions

1. Some sentence structures may be frequently repeated, but the response still demonstrates some sentence structure variety
2. Subordination, coordination, and parallelism are largely correct with a few significant errors
   - May contain frequent wordy and/or awkward construction
   - Transitional words and conjunctive adverbs are either absent, used inappropriately or do not contribute to overall clarity
3. May contain a few run-on sentences, fused sentences and/or sentence fragments
4. May contain frequent errors with commonly confused words and homonyms, including contractions or not applicable
5. May contain occasional subject-verb agreement errors
6. Demonstrates appropriate use of pronoun usage (e.g. pronouns and their antecedents agree, unclear pronoun references are avoided and pronoun cases are used properly)
7. Demonstrates largely correct word order with correctly placed modifiers, but may contain occasional errors
8. May contain occasional capitalization errors
9. May contain frequent apostrophe errors or not applicable
10. May contain frequent punctuation errors or not applicable
11. May contain frequent errors in mechanics and conventions that occasionally interfere with comprehension
12. Standard usage is at a minimally acceptable level of appropriateness for on-demand draft writing
Where Are Students Likely to Get Stuck?

• Identifying different types of evidence
• Determining the best supported argument
• Providing a rationale for why the argument was best supported
• Bringing in “outside” information through evaluation of why evidence connects
• Opting for personal opinion not reasoned judgment
You can always edit a bad page. You can’t edit a blank page.

— Jodi Picoult
Resources
The Extended Response

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c8Gg-yknu9Y
So, how do I find the scoring tool?
Check the Resources

Extended Response Tools and Practice

Use these resources to improve your students’ written responses. The scoring tools help you evaluate and provide feedback to students about their RLA GED Ready® written response.

**English**
- Extended Response Quick Tips
- Extended Response Scoring Tools
- Extended Response Classroom Practice
- Extended Response Classroom Poster

**Spanish**
- Extended Response Quick Tips - Spanish
- Extended Response Scoring Tools - Spanish
- Extended Response Classroom Practice - Spanish
- Explanation of AE Symbol Tool For Spanish Writing

Reasoning Through Language Arts - Extended Response Scoring Tools

**English**
- ER Resource Guide for Adult Educators
- ER Resource Guide for Adult Educators - Taxation and Revenue
- Scoring Tool for the GED Ready® practice test
- GED Ready® Practice Test FR and Source Texts

**Spanish**
- ER Resource Guide for Adult Educators - in Spanish
- ER Resource Guide for Adult Educators - Taxation and Revenue - in Spanish
- Scoring Tool for the GED Ready® practice test - in Spanish
- GED Ready® Practice Test FR and Source Texts - in Spanish
Access GED Webinars and More

https://ged.com/educators_admins/program/

Thinking Strategies for Crafting Constructed Responses:
Part 1 - Evaluating Evidence to Support a Claim
Tuesdays for Teachers Webinar
May 24, 2016

Thinking Strategies for Crafting Constructed Responses:
Part 2 - One Step at a Time
Tuesdays for Teachers Webinar
June 28, 2016
Thank you!

Communicate with GED Testing Service®
help@ged.com

Debi Faucette – Debi.Faucette@GED.com

Susan Pittman – skptvs@gmail.com