

# Florida

Standards Assessments

## **GRADE 10**

# **2015 FSA ELA WRITING**

### **SCORING SAMPLER**

### **Copyright Statement for This Office of Assessment Publication**

Authorization for reproduction of this document is hereby granted to persons acting in an official capacity within the Uniform System of Public K–12 Schools as defined in Section 1000.01(4), Florida Statutes. This copyright notice must be included in all copies.

All trademarks and trade names found in this publication are the property of their respective owners and are not associated with the publisher of this publication.

Permission is NOT granted for distribution or reproduction outside the Uniform System of Public K–12 Schools or for commercial distribution of the copyrighted materials without written authorization from the Florida Department of Education. Questions regarding use of these copyrighted materials should be sent to the following:

Office of Assessment  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 414  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400

Copyright © 2015  
State of Florida  
Department of State

# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>TEXT-BASED WRITING SOURCES</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>INFORMATIVE/EXPLANATORY TEXT-BASED WRITING RUBRIC</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>SAMPLE STUDENT RESPONSES</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Sample 1 (S-1) Student Response Score Point 4/4/2 .....	8
Sample 2 (S-2) Student Response Score Point 4/4/2 .....	12
Sample 3 (S-3) Student Response Score Point 4/2/2 .....	15
Sample 4 (S-4) Student Response Score Point 3/3/2 .....	18
Sample 5 (S-5) Student Response Score Point 3/2/2 .....	21
Sample 6 (S-6) Student Response Score Point 3/2/1 .....	24
Sample 7 (S-7) Student Response Score Point 2/2/2 .....	27
Sample 8 (S-8) Student Response Score Point 2/1/2 .....	30
Sample 9 (S-9) Student Response Score Point 1/1/1 .....	32
Sample 10 (S-10) Student Response Score Point 1/1/0 .....	34

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Florida Standards Assessments (FSA) English Language Arts (ELA) Writing Scoring Sampler can be used as a resource for Florida educators, schools, and districts regarding the scoring of student responses on the writing component of the statewide ELA assessments. Each spring, students in grades 4–10 are administered a passage set and a text-based writing prompt for the FSA ELA Writing test. Students respond either to an informative/explanatory prompt or to an opinion/argumentation prompt. Unlike the types of writing prompts administered on statewide writing assessments in the past, the FSA prompts are text dependent—based on the passage set each student is provided—which focuses on a specific purpose for writing. Students draw on reading and writing skills while integrating information from the passage set in order to develop and draft a cohesive essay response.

This sampler contains sample student responses that illustrate the score points described in the applicable scoring rubric; the passage (text) set and text-based writing prompt can be accessed via a hyperlink provided on the next page. As with all FSA content, the sample passage set and prompt were reviewed by a committee of Florida educators to ensure appropriateness for the intended grade in terms of the text complexity, topic, and wording.

In this sampler, examples of student responses represent some of the various combinations of the score points across the scoring domains. As a basis for developing a common understanding of the scoring criteria, an annotation follows the response to explain the prominent characteristics of the response described in the rubric. These responses are not intended to provide a full spectrum of examples for each score point in each domain. Moreover, they do not necessarily represent the highest or lowest example of each score point in each domain.

It should be noted that in addition to responses that receive the scores described in the rubric for each domain, some responses earn a score of “0” due to certain conditions as follows:

- The entire response is written in a language other than English.
- The response is illegible, is incomprehensible, includes an insufficient amount of writing to be evaluated, or is completely copied from the source material with no original work.
- The response is completely off topic, and the Conventions domain is scored; this condition could result in a score of 0, 1, or 2 points.

Because a response that is left completely blank does not meet attemptedness criteria for FSA ELA Writing, no score can be earned or reported for the combined Reading/Writing components that the FSA ELA test comprises.

To access additional resources related to the ELA assessments, please visit the Florida Standards Assessments portal at [fsassessments.org/resources/](https://fsassessments.org/resources/).

The Florida Standards in English Language Arts (Writing Strand) describe what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. For more information about the Florida Standards, please visit CPALMS at [www.cpalms.org/Public/search/Standard](http://www.cpalms.org/Public/search/Standard).

### **TEXT-BASED WRITING SOURCES**

To offer students a variety of texts on the FSA ELA Writing tests, authentic and copyrighted passages and articles appear as they were originally published, as requested by the publisher and/or author. While these real-world examples do not always adhere to strict style conventions and/or grammar rules, inconsistencies among passages should not detract from students' ability to understand and respond to the text-based writing task.

To view the passage "Car-Free Cities," click <https://scoringguides.airast.org>.

## INFORMATIVE/EXPLANATORY TEXT-BASED WRITING RUBRIC

<b>Grades 6–10</b> <b>Informative/Explanatory Text-based Writing Rubric</b> <b>(Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below.)</b>			
<b>Score</b>	<b>Purpose, Focus, and Organization</b> <b>(4-point Rubric)</b>	<b>Evidence and Elaboration</b> <b>(4-point Rubric)</b>	<b>Conventions of Standard English</b> <b>(2-point Rubric begins at score point 2)</b>
<b>4</b>	<p>The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task; and it has a clear controlling idea and effective organizational structure creating coherence and completeness. The response includes most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly maintained controlling idea with little or no loosely related material</li> <li>• Skillful use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>• Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end with a satisfying introduction and conclusion</li> <li>• Appropriate style and objective tone established and maintained</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing support, citing evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smoothly integrated, thorough, and relevant evidence, including precise references to sources</li> <li>• Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques (including but not limited to definitions, quotations, and examples), demonstrating an understanding of the topic and text</li> <li>• Clear and effective expression of ideas, using precise language</li> <li>• Academic and domain-specific vocabulary clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>• Varied sentence structure, demonstrating language facility</li> </ul>	
<b>3</b>	<p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and task; and it has a clear controlling idea and evident organizational structure with a sense of completeness. The response includes most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained controlling idea, though some loosely related material may be present</li> <li>• Adequate use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>• Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end with a sufficient introduction and conclusion</li> <li>• Appropriate style and objective tone established</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate support, citing evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally integrated and relevant evidence from sources, though references may be general or imprecise</li> <li>• Adequate use of some elaborative techniques</li> <li>• Adequate expression of ideas, employing a mix of precise and general language</li> <li>• Domain-specific vocabulary generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>• Some variation in sentence structure</li> </ul>	

*Continued on the following page*

<b>Grades 6–10</b> <b>Informative/Explanatory Text-based Writing Rubric</b> <b>(Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below.)</b>			
<b>Score</b>	<b>Purpose, Focus, and Organization</b> <b>(4-point Rubric)</b>	<b>Evidence and Elaboration</b> <b>(4-point Rubric)</b>	<b>Conventions of Standard English</b> <b>(2-point Rubric)</b>
<b>2</b>	<p>The response is somewhat sustained within the purpose, audience, and task but may include loosely related or extraneous material; and it may have a controlling idea with an inconsistent organizational structure. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused controlling idea but insufficiently sustained or unclear</li> <li>• Inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety</li> <li>• Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end with an inadequate introduction or conclusion</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes partial use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weakly integrated evidence from sources; erratic or irrelevant references or citations</li> <li>• Repetitive or ineffective use of elaborative techniques</li> <li>• Imprecise or simplistic expression of ideas</li> <li>• Some use of inappropriate domain-specific vocabulary</li> <li>• Most sentences limited to simple constructions</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some minor errors in usage but no patterns of errors</li> <li>• Adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<p>The response is related to the topic but may demonstrate little or no awareness of the purpose, audience, and task; and it may have little or no controlling idea or discernible organizational structure. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confusing or ambiguous ideas</li> <li>• Few or no transitional strategies</li> <li>• Frequent extraneous ideas that impede understanding</li> <li>• Too brief to demonstrate knowledge of focus or organization</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea, including little if any use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal, absent, erroneous, or irrelevant evidence or citations from the source material</li> <li>• Expression of ideas that is vague, unclear, or confusing</li> <li>• Limited and often inappropriate language or domain-specific vocabulary</li> <li>• Sentences limited to simple constructions</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of basic conventions. The response may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various errors in usage</li> <li>• Inconsistent use of correct punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>			<p>The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions, with frequent and severe errors often obscuring meaning.</p>

As the global concern for the environment increases with time, the desire to use cars decreases. People are aware that cars release fumes which, when combined, can be detrimental for the environment, and they want to do something about it. Elisabeth Rosenthal writes in her New York Times article, "In German Suburb, Life Goes on Without Cars", that up to fifty percent of environmental greenhouse gas pollution comes from the cars driven in American suburbs. In her article, she quotes David Goldberg, an official of Transportation for America, that "All of our [the U.S.A.'s] development since World War II has been centered on the car, and that will have to change". It seems like America, and the rest of the world, is becoming more aware about what cars can do to the environment and that car usage needs to decrease, and they are taking steps to do so. So why should *you* limit your car usage? By limiting car usage, the average citizen can decrease pollution and harmful greenhouse gases that are causing damage to the environment, improve living conditions in large cities and reduce smog, and feel better in general, with more exercise and less stress.

In the past decade, America has struggled with an obesity epidemic. In the early 2000s, obesity was at its peak, with McDonalds' "Super Size" menu options, huge SUVs, and endless television programs to keep couch potatoes on the couch. If you visit New York City's Manhattan, you won't see a whole lot of obese people hurrying down 5th avenue to hop on the subway or pick up groceries at the local market. Why is this? Not many people drive in NYC, mainly because it would be far too expensive to buy and park a car in this already monumentally expensive city. The cars one does generally see are either from out of state, taxis, or businessmen who live in the other boroughs of the city. Very few who live in Manhattan drive. Most people take the subway, walk, or use bikes to get around. Because of the way it's made, everything one needs is just a few blocks away, from the grocery store, to the drugstore, to the postoffice, to the bank, there really is no need to have a car. If you have to go to the airport, just take a cab. Naturally, people who walk and bike everywhere are slimmer and healthier. In the suburbs, this is not the story. Many people in the suburbs drive cars out necessity, because it would take the whole day to walk to the grocery store and back. The way suburbs are set up, walking or biking is almost impossible to do if it's not for leisure. Driving around all day to pick up kids, go to work, and finally pull into the home garage can be draining and stressful. If people were to get around and get exercise at the same time, they would be less stressed and healthier. Andrew Selsky quoted businessman Carlos Arturo Plaza in his article, "Car-free day is spinning into a big hit in Bogota". Plaza said that, "It's [limiting car usage] a good opportunity to take away stress and lower air pollution". Many people are already doing this. Vauban, Germany, is a new "car-free" suburb. In this town, things are close together, just

like a city, eliminating the need to use cars. It is not illegal to own a car in Vauban, but people who do must pay a heavy fine and pay for parking on the edge of the city that is also highly expensive. People in the German suburb get along fine without cars, because of the way the city was built. The idea of a “car-reduced” community appeals to the U.S. as well, and legislators and other government officials are trying to make it happen for the environment as well as the sake of the people.

Beijing is supposedly the most polluted city in the world, and Paris the most beautiful, but Paris is more polluted than one would think. Robert Duffer reports in his article, “Paris bans driving due to smog”, that Paris, after suffering from “five days of intensive smog” called for some drivers to abstain from using their cars for the day or face a fine of twenty-two euros. The system was based on license plate numbers. One day, the drivers with even numbered license plates would not be able to drive, the next the ones with odd numbered license plates. This helped reduce smog in the city, which is more polluted than others in Europe like Brussels and London. Once the smog cleared, the ban was rescinded. This ban on cars, although only for a short period of time, is actually a great idea. Emissions from cars cause a large amount of smog to pollute the air, which is bad for both the inhabitants of the city and the environment. The reduction of the use of cars will reduce the amount of smog in the air in large cities, and improve the living conditions in those cities. Almost two centuries ago, smog, soot, and dirt covered Victorian London and its people. This smog was not from cars, but rather from the rising popularity of factories powered by fossil fuels such as coal. Today, all cities of the world are polluted, and almost two hundred years have passed. Shouldn’t some improvements regarding the environment and smog in cities have been made by now? There is just as much environmental damage being done as there was in 19th century London, but now, instead of factories being the main cause, it’s cars. Although cities are cleaner now, they are just as polluted. In Beijing, some say the air is so dirty that if you blow your nose, your tissue turns black! It is the 21st century, and we have to be taking strides to improve the environment for the good of the people who live in cities like Paris and Beijing.

Limiting car usage is important to create a better living environment for people as well as improve their well-being, but the most important reason is to limit pollution and damage to the environment due to emissions from cars. President Obama, according to Elisabeth Rosenthal in her article, “The End of Car Culture”, has “ambitious goals to curb the United States’ greenhouse gas emissions”. If the President of the United States is concerned, this means it is a real problem. The immense amount of greenhouse gases caused by cars has already aided Global Warming and the damage to the ozone layer that exists today. If car usage increases or holds steady, even more damage will be done, so much so that it may become unfixable in the future. If the world does not cut back now on its vehicle

usage and reduce environmental damage, things will only get harder to fix. But things are looking good for Mother Nature, because according to all four articles given, including, "In German Suburb, Life Goes on Without Cars", by Elisabeth Rosenthal, "Paris bans driving due to smog", by Robert Duffer, "Car-free day is spinning into a big hit in Bogota", by Andrew Selsky, and "The End of Car Culture", by Elisabeth Rosenthal, people are already taking steps to reduce the use of cars and better the environment.

Ever since the Model T came out in the early 20th century, cars have become more and more popular in America as well as around the world. They have become so popular, in fact, that they have become a problem. Cars emit harmful greenhouse gases that pollute the environment and cause excess smog in large cities. They can also be stressful and unhealthy for people who depend on them for everyday modes of transport. Limiting car usage is important and will help not only the environment, but also the people of the world.

**4-Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task. An effective organizational structure creates coherence and completeness. A satisfying introduction provides context for a clear controlling idea (*By limiting car usage, the average citizen can decrease pollution and harmful greenhouse gases that are causing damage to the environment, improve living conditions in large cities and reduce smog, and feel better in general, with more exercise and less stress*). The controlling idea is strongly maintained. A variety of transitional strategies, external (*In the past decade, Beijing is supposedly the most polluted city in the world, Ever since the Model T*) and internal (*Because of the way it's made, If you have to go to the airport, One day*), are skillfully used to connect ideas and clarify the relationships between and among ideas. The progression of ideas is logical from beginning to end, creating cohesion in the response (*legislators and other government officials are trying to make it happen for the environment as well as the sake of the people, we have to be taking strides to improve the environment for the good of the people, Limiting car usage is important to create a better living environment for people as well as improve their well-being*). The satisfying conclusion contributes to the completeness (*Limiting car usage is important and will help not only the environment, but also the people of the world*). Appropriate style and objective tone are maintained.

**4-Evidence and Elaboration**

The response provides thorough and convincing support, citing evidence for the controlling idea. Evidence from the source material is smoothly integrated, relevant, and includes some precise references (*Elisabeth Rosenthal writes; In her article, she quotes David Goldberg, an official of Transportation for America*). Information from more than one source is carefully chosen to support the controlling idea. The response effectively uses relevant non-source-based information as support, but then further elaborates on ideas with facts and details from the source material throughout the response. For example, in the second body paragraph a comparison is made of Paris from Source 2 to Victorian England (*The reduction of the use of cars will reduce the amount of smog . . . Almost two centuries ago, smog, soot, and dirt covered Victorian London . . . This smog was not from cars, but rather from the rising popularity of factories . . . Today, all cities of the world are polluted, and almost two hundred years have passed*). A clear understanding of the source material is demonstrated through this effective technique. Expression of ideas is clear and effective, aided by precise word choice and sentences of varying structure (*The immense amount of greenhouse gases caused by cars has already aided Global Warming and the damage to the ozone layer that exists today*).

**2-Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Spelling, punctuation, capitalization, usage, and sentence formation are adequate in this draft response.

Limiting the usage of cars has personal and professional support all across the globe and yet it has yet to be embraced everywhere. Statistical proof show where it may help and real life examples of some of the effects of reducing, or getting rid of altogether, cars in one's daily life. While "recent studies suggest that Americans are buying fewer cars, driving less and getting fewer licenses as each year goes by" (Source 4), is that really enough or for the right reason? There are plenty of reasons to stop, or limit, the amount of cars being driven on the roads for every kind of person, from the hippie to the businessman, from the mom to the college student. With so many things in this world that few people agree on, this is a nice change to see in regards the removal of so many cars. Why would they all agree, one might ask. Well, there are plenty of reasons.

For starters, stress. It is no secret that morning traffic jams and 5'o'clock traffic is often enough to send any driver into a fit of unadulterated rage and what better way is there to prevent that than to simply not drive at all? Mother and media trainer, Heidrum Walter attested to this after moving into a mostly car-less community, claiming "when [she] had a car [she] was always tense. [She's] much happier [that] way" (Source 1). If that were not enough, businessman Carlos Arturo Plaza who participated in the Day Without Cars in Bogota, Colombia, after just a day was able to say "it's a good oppurtunity to take away stress" (Source 3). Just one day was enough to de-stress this man and if that does not speak wonders, one has to wonder what does. The event "[left] the streets of [Bogota] eerily devoid of traffic jams" (Source 3), which goes to show how stressful it was everyday, with traffic jams a common occurance. No one enjoys them, so why continue to suffer through them?

Additionally, the environment suffers greatly from the many car emissions let out on the roads. "Passenger cars are responsible for 12 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in Europe ... and up to 50 percent in some car-intensive areas in the United States" (Source 1). This alone should be enough to horrify anyone out of such copious amounts of car usage. If that were not enough, "transportation is the second largest source of America's emissions" (Source 4). It is clear that cars are only doing more harm to this earth all humans live on and happen to only have one of, so there is no need to continue on knowing this without changing something about that. Even car-pooling could significantly reduce emissions as there would be less cars out there, which is possible through "more flexible commuting arrangements, including the evolution of shared van services for getting to work" (Source 4).

Of course, adding the last two reasons together makes for another very important factor in all of this: everyone's general health. Both stress and high concentrations of smog can do a toll on one's body and the reduction of cars, once again, helps to reduce this terrible down-sides to the easy transportation option. If it must be described as "emissions ... are choking cities" (Source 1), then why not be a bit more concerned. Air pollution can affect those with pre-existing respiratory issues and stress can be a deciding factor in how efficient and well a person can function. Stress on the road can lead to unsafe driving and a worse performance at work, school, or any other task-oriented location that many go to with the aid of a car.

It is also worth noting that cities that have embraced a no car lifestyle such as Vauban or Bogota have generally improved as a community and have given back anything the newly car-less citizens may have been missing out on through saving them time and money. In Vauban, "stores are placed a walk away, on a main street, rather than in malls along some distant highway" (Source 1). This is not only much more cost-efficient, but also convenient. This is saving both time and money, just like in Bogota where "parks and sports centers [ ] have bloomed throughout the city; uneven, pitted sidewalks have been replaced by broad, smooth sidewalks; rush-hour restrictions have dramatically cut traffic; and new restaurants and upscale shopping districts have cropped up" (Source 3). Not only does this help individual citizens and business owners, it helps the overall economy of the city as well.

Individual car use *isn't* bad. Millions of individuals using cars, however, is very bad. Note the emphasis. Even just making a conscious effort to car pool, bike to work or school, use public transportation, or use some sort of alternative transportation could be enough to clear up the air of some of its emissions, keep oneself and others happier and less stressed, save time and money, and improve their city all in one little decision. It's just a matter of going ahead and doing it, so what is stopping anyone from going out and making that change now? Be the change you want to see and limit your car usage now.

**4-Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task. An effective organizational structure creates coherence and completeness. The satisfying introduction includes a clear controlling idea (*There are plenty of reasons to stop, or limit, the amount of cars being driven on the roads*). Skillful use of a variety of transitional strategies clearly serves to connect ideas. External transitions connect the ideas from paragraph to paragraph (*For starters; Of course, adding the last two reasons together; It is also worth noting*), and internal transitions clarify the relationships between and among the ideas (*If that were not enough, If it must be described, In Vauban*). The progression of ideas is logical from beginning to end; ideas from one paragraph (*why continue to suffer through them?*) are carried into the next (*Additionally, the environment suffers greatly*), creating a sense of cohesion. The controlling idea is strongly maintained throughout. A satisfying conclusion with a call to action (*Be the change you want to see and limit your car usage now*) contributes to the completeness of the response. Appropriate style is maintained.

**4-Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides thorough and convincing support, citing evidence for the controlling idea. Evidence from the source material is smoothly integrated and relevant. Information from more than one source is carefully chosen to support each point. In the first body paragraph, the response takes an idea (*morning traffic jams and 5'o'clock traffic is often enough to send any driver into a fit of unadulterated rage*) and elaborates with relevant information from the source material (*"when [she] had a car [she] was always tense . . ."* (Source 1)), moving seamlessly into additional information from another source to further support the idea (*If that were not enough, businessman Carlos Arturo Plaza*). Effective elaboration demonstrating an understanding of the source material continues throughout the response (*Both stress and high concentrations of smog can do a toll on one's body . . . reduction of cars, once again, helps . . . "emissions . . . are choking cities" (Source 1) . . . Air pollution can affect those with pre-existing respiratory issues and stress*). Expression of ideas is clear and effective, aided by precise word choice and varied sentences (*Stress on the road can lead to unsafe driving and a worse performance at work, school, or any other task-oriented location*).

**2-Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

For years, the United States has been mass producing and using cars. It may sound surprising, but America has already reached its peak when it comes to buying cars. More and more people around the globe have begun to realize the benefits of using alternative means of transportation. Places such as Vauban, Bogata, Paris, and even New York have implemented programs to encourage the limited use of cars. The idea of giving up such a comfort may sound tragic at first, but reducing car usage has many advantages.

We use cars everyday for pretty basic purposes. To get to work or school or to run errands are just a few examples. Now, imagine what would happen if a car were not available to you. It probably would not be the end of the world. You could catch a bus or ask for a ride from somebody. If you really needed to, you could even ride your bike or walk to wherever you needed to go. People in the past tended to fear using alternative transport, for varying reasons. Maybe friends or family are not willing to give rides. Maybe the sheer thought of walking a mile may seem terrifying or ridiculous. The most common reason is probably that having a car is just too convenient, it seems that there is no need for any other way of transportation! But life can and should be adjusted to fit into these sources of transport. In Vauban, Germany, for example, residents have given up their cars in favor of a life without them. It just proves that contrary to popular belief, cars are actually not a necessity!

Citizens in Vauban, Germany walk or ride bicycles when they need to go someplace. It's almost needless to say this, but they have a much healthier lifestyle than most car-owners in the United States! They are not afraid of walking or riding a bike a bit to get where they need to. Not only are these people in better physical shape, but one mother, Heidrum Walter, tells us that when she had a car, she was always tense, but now that she has given it up, she seems happier. Carlos Arturo Plaza, in Bogata, Columbia, says that using his bike on their annual no-car day reduces his stress levels. There is a direct correlation between physical activity and mental well-being. The more activity, the better you feel. By limiting car usage, we are also encouraging the physical exercise that comes in place of it, making us a happier, healthier community.

Maybe the most important reason to reduce car usage is to protect our environment. By obtaining and burning fossil fuels, we are both running out of this resource and posing the threat of spills and air pollution to our environment. The gasoline we use to fill our cars certainly won't last forever. It won't even last for much longer at the rate we are burning it at. Also, spills can be devastating to the ecosystem it impacts, as we have seen in the past, for example the BP oil spill. Perhaps the biggest disadvantage to the gasoline we use to fill our cars is the air pollution it leaves behind. Transportation is the second leading source of emissions in the US, behind power plants. Also, in Paris, the smog from automobiles got to be so bad that they set laws to ban cars on certain days. Just by reducing car

usage for a few days, the smog cleared tremendously. It wouldn't be hard at all for each individual in this community to cut back on the amount of time they spend driving in their cars, if for no other reason than to keep our Earth clean.

Over the years, we Americans have grown accustomed to relying on cars for our every need, but we can't do that anymore. As a community, we need to open our eyes and see the changes happening around us. Cars are not a necessity. We don't even need to completely get rid of them, but it is necessary for us to cut back, for the sake of our health and our environment. It may take some getting used to, but I promise, it is more than possible. In the words of Bill Ford, we can soon move forward to a world where "pedestrian, bicycle, private cars, commercial and public transportation traffic are woven into a connected network to save time, conserve resources, lower emissions, and improve safety."

**4–Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task. An effective organizational structure creates coherence and completeness. The satisfying introduction includes a clear controlling idea (*More and more people around the globe have begun to realize the benefits of using alternative means of transportation*). The body paragraphs build on one another through the skillful use of a variety of transitional strategies. External transitions connect ideas between the paragraphs (*We use cars everyday; Citizens in Vauban, Germany; Maybe the most important reason; Over the years*), and internal transitions clarify the relationships among the ideas (*If you really needed to, Not only, By obtaining and burning*). A logical progression of ideas is present from beginning to end; the first body paragraph presents a scenario (*imagine what would happen if a car were not available to you*) with the idea continuing into the second body paragraph (*I just proves that contrary to popular belief, cars are actually not a neccesity! Citizens in Vauban, Germany*). The controlling idea is strongly maintained throughout. The satisfying conclusion contributes to the completeness of the response (*Over the years, we Americans have grown accustomed to relying on cars . . . we need to open our eyes and see the changes*). Appropriate style and objective tone are maintained.

**2–Evidence and Elaboration**

The response provides thorough and convincing support for the controlling idea. Evidence from the source material is smoothly integrated and relevant. Elaboration is effective. The first body paragraph poses a scenario that smoothly integrates information from Source 1 (*Now, imagine what would happen if a car were not available to you . . . If you really needed to . . . But life can and should be adjusted . . . In Vauban, Germany, for example, residents have given up their cars*). Elaborating further on the idea, the response explains how the citizens of Vauban get around and moves into the idea of a healthier lifestyle being a positive result of limiting car usage using information from the source material to support the new idea (*Heidrum Walter, tells us . . . she was always tense . . . she seems happier*). This idea is expanded further by explaining the causal relationship *between physical activity and mental well-being*. The third body paragraph smoothly integrates information from more than one source to support the idea of *protect[ing] our environment*. Relevant information not from the source material is also used as support (*BP oil spill*). A clear and effective expression of ideas is used throughout the response, with precise word choice and varied sentences demonstrating language facility (*Perhaps the biggest disadvantage to the gasoline we use to fill our cars is the air pollution it leaves behind*). This response is consistent, thorough, and effective in the Evidence and Elaboration domain; however, without a citation in a text-based writing task, the highest score a response may receive in this domain is a 2.

**2–Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors in spelling (*limitted, neccesity*) do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

The advantages that come along with reducing car usage are endless. America and the whole world actually, have depended on the car for so long that its hard to imagine a world more dependent on bikes and public transit than our own personal vehicles; that time has come. Along with the limiting of car usage come the benefits of happier, less tense individuals, smog and greenhouse gas reduction, and the possibility to get around in an easier fashion without all the havoc of traffic jams.

For starters, cars tend to create a tenser and uneasier society. In the article “In German Suburb, Life Goes On Withoutr Cars” by Elisabeth Rosentha, media trainer Heidrun Walter, shared her personal experience from living without a car and expressed how she is happier living that way because before she was always tense. Additionally, in Andrew Selky’s artcle regarding the car-free day in Bogota, Carlos Arturo Plaza commented how the day was a “good oppurtunity to take away stress.” Both these accounts from two different people on two different parts of the world support the fact that the reduction of car usage has aided them to lower stress as will decreasing the use of cars all together. Stress is a huge facor in today’s age and I for one believe that the world would be better off without it; which is why lowerig the amount of cars used would be the optimal choice.

Another significant reason as to why car usage should be lowered is the fact that it decreases the amount of smog and greenhouse gases in the air. Referring back to Rosenthal’s article, she included how experts have said that the overuse of automobiles in Chicago and Shanghai has been a great setback to the current efforts being used toward reducing greenhouse gasses, which are emmitted from the tailpipe. Accordingly, in Paris there was a partial driving ban to clean the air after days of almost record pollution, wrote Robert Duffer in his article. In additon, in Rosenthal’s other article “The End of Car Culture,” she wrote how Obama’s plan to reduce the United States’ greenhouse gas output has been helped by the decrease in Americans that are driving less each year. All in all, the reduction in car usage will result to a decrease in greenhouse gases that will better our enviroment and benefit the world entirely.

Included in all the multitude of reasons why car limiting is advantageous, is the guarantee of less crowded streets allowing easier management of public transportation and bicycle use which ultimately assist society in becoming more active. In Rosenthal’s article “The End of Car Culture” she wrote about how Bill Ford stated that he wanted to construct amazing cities where “pedestrian, bicycle, private cars, commerical and public transportaion traffic are woven into a connected network to save time, conserve resources, lower emissions and improve safety.” This here shows a vast amount of benefits which are the results of less cars around the world shaping a better place. Additonally, in Selksy’s article he stated how the car-free day left the city devoided of traffic jams which lets admit, we all find horrible and would be better off without them. Selky’s also

S-4

Score Point 3/3/2

(page 2 of 3)

included in his article how “rush-hour restrictions have dramatically cut traffic;” adding to the fantastic advantages of lowering car usage; they help in letting us enjoy our time elsewhere having a joyous than in the middle of a busy and and nerve-wrecking rush hour.

To finish off, along with limiting car usage come a plethora of magnificent rewards. This includes the drop in numbers of tense and not content individuals, a fleeting decrease in the amount of greenhouse gases and smog in the atmosphere, and the ease of avoiding those pesky traffic jams and annoying time delays. To conclude, I’m sure we can all agree that the pros of removing the amount of cars used are seemingly limitless.

**3–Purpose/Focus /Organization**

The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and task. Evident organizational structure is present. A sufficient introduction includes a clear controlling idea (*Along with the limiting of car usage come the benefits of happier, less tense individuals, smog and greenhouse gas reduction, and the possibility to get around in an easier fashion without all the havoc of traffic jams*). Focus on the controlling idea is maintained throughout the response. Each body paragraph addresses one point to support the controlling idea. Transitional strategies are somewhat varied; both external (*For starters, Another significant reason, Included in all the multitude of reasons*) and internal (*In the article, Additionally, Accordingly*) transitions serve to connect ideas. Ideas adequately progress from beginning to end (*In the article “In German Suburb . . . Additionally, in Andrew Selky’s article . . . Both these accounts from two different people*). A sufficient conclusion provides a sense of completeness (*To conclude, I’m sure we can all agree that the pros of removing the amount of cars used are seemingly limitless*). Style is generally appropriate (*a vast amount of benefits which are the results of less cars around the world shaping a better place*).

**3–Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides adequate support, citing evidence for the controlling idea. Evidence from the source material is relevant and generally integrated. Information from more than one source is used to support a point. For example, in the second body paragraph, Sources 1, 3, and 4 are used to support the point regarding *greenhouse gas reduction* (*overuse of automobiles in Chicago and Shanghai has been a great setback, in Paris there was a partial driving ban to clean the air, Obama’s plan to reduce the United States’ greenhouse gas output*). The elaboration on this point connects back to the controlling idea (*All in all, the reduction in car usage will result to a decrease in greenhouse gases that will better our enviroment and benefit the world entirely*). An adequate expression of ideas throughout the response is presented through the mix of precise and general language (*ultimately assist society in becoming more active, the ease of avoiding those pesky traffic jams and annoying time delays*). Sentences are varied.

**2–Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors in spelling (*artcle, lowerig, emmited*), punctuation (missing commas), and usage (*less* for fewer, *devoided* for devoid) do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

Recent trends are showing that the average person is trading in their keys for a more contemporary mode of transportation, such as public transit or walking and biking from point A to point B. Even though the reason as to why this is occurring has yet to become clear, there are some general benefits that are known to come from this. More and more, cities in developed and developing nations are now being planned to be more dense, so that the citizens in them can get to where they need to be, without needing a car. Because of this, fewer greenhouse emissions are being created, there is less congestion and smog in cities, and the burden of traffic is being lifted from the everyday driver. The more this trend continues, the more beneficial it can become.

Climate change is a ubiquitous threat to the world. In order to face and reverse the direction of where the world is heading, some cities are finding new ways to face this issue. For example, a city in Germany has practically given up cars through its policies and design. Citizens are only allowed two places to park, and the city is designed so that everything you need is within a walking or biking distance, albeit more dense. More and more places are slowly beginning to adopt this style of suburb because “emissions from an increasing middle class are choking cities” (source 1). Making this change will not be easy, but it is important because “passenger cars are responsible for 12 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in Europe... and up to 50 percent [...] in the United States” (source 1).

Another issue that weighs down cities everywhere is the horrid smog and unbearable congestion most cities face. In order to combat this adverse effect of driving, Paris has banned driving in efforts to reduce the smog it deals with. The effort proved to create a temporary solution, as “congestion was down 60 percent in the capital of France, after five-days of intensifying smog” (source 2). A city in Bogota, Columbia has taken a day off from driving, and the results were so positive that the movement has spread to multiple cities in neighboring countries. This movement “[left] the street eerily devoid of traffic jams” (source 3).

In an ever changing world that exists today with cities that never sleep, the average person is constantly burdened and stressed by things that tend to pile up. So why have driving and traffic be added to that heap of annoyance, especially if it’s avoidable? The fact is, driving can be incredibly stressful and sometimes border on superfluous. A resident of the densely populated german town where 70 percent of its citizens don’t own cars claimed, “when I had a car, I was always tense. I’m much happier this way”, referring to how they no longer need to own a car or drive (source 1). The day of no driving in Bogota, Columbia has been said to be “a good oppurtunity to take away stress” (source 3).

S-5

Score Point 3/2/2

(page 2 of 3)

Modern nations have revolved heavily on the invention and continuous innovation of the automobile. However, the increasing dependence on this mode of transportation has created some adverse affects for the general population of the world. In order to solve this problem, an emphasis on cleaner and more efficient modes of transportation must occur, along with more densely designed, modern cities. A larger independence from cars can create fewer greenhouse emissions, cause less congestion and smog in cities, and make the average citizen free from the stress of driving. Change will only ensue with a more proactive stance on this issue.

**3–Purpose/Focus /Organization**

The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and task. A sufficient introduction that includes a clear controlling idea (*More and more, cities in developed and developing nations are now being planned to be more dense, so that the citizens in them can get to where they need to be, without needing a car*) and three points (*fewer greenhouse emissions are being created, there is less congestion and smog in cities, and the burden of traffic is being lifted from the everyday driver*) is present. The controlling idea is maintained throughout the response, with each of the points focusing on the benefits of limiting car usage addressed in the body paragraphs. Varied transitional strategies are used to clarify the relationships between the ideas; better external transitions introduce each new point (*Climate change is a ubiquitous threat to the world, Another issue that weighs down, In an ever changing world*), and internal transitions are adequate (*For example, The fact is, In order to solve this problem*). Ideas progress adequately from beginning to end (*the average person is constantly burdened and stressed . . . So why have driving and traffic be added . . . The fact is, driving can be incredibly stressful*). The sufficient conclusion contributes to the sense of completeness of the response (*Change will only ensue with a more proactive stance on this issue*). Style is appropriate.

**2–Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides cursory support or evidence for the controlling idea. Cited evidence to support the controlling idea is used; however, the evidence is weakly integrated throughout much of the response. Development consists of over-quoting or paraphrasing information from the source material. This style of development is ineffective, as it is mostly a list of relevant quotes from the source material with little original thought explaining the advantages of limiting car usage (*More and more places are slowly beginning to adopt this lifestyle of suburb because “emissions from an increasing middle class . . .” (source 1). Making this change will not be easy, but it is important because “passenger cars are responsible”*). While the vocabulary is generally appropriate and sentence variety is present, holistically, this response remains at this score point due to its lack of elaboration to further ideas from the source material.

**2–Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors in spelling (*oppurtunity*), capitalization (*german*), and usage (*their* for his/her) do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

The car has been one of the most massive cultural influences from the time it became popular in the early 1900's up to today. It found a way to revolutionise the way people got from point A to point B and it has affected countless aspects of our lives, especially where we live in a community. But what if that is all over? For the first time ever, we are seeing the car becoming less popular and the percent of the population who have a drivers licence getting smaller. This drop in interest for cars could be due to people and governments realising the benefits of a automobile free lifestyle. Many places around the world today are experimenting with the possibility of life without cars and possibly providing a window into the future of what life may be like for the whole world.

The social effect of life without cars can be observed in many experiments with communities around the world. Vauban, a town in Germany, prohibits its residents to own a personal garage, drive on the streets or bring their car anywhere near their home. As a result, the vast majority of residents there do not own a car. The streets are filled with pedestrians and people on bikes, every store is within walking distance from residential districts and only rarely does one hear the sound of a car's engine in the distance. Vauban has been an experiment to see if a life without cars is possible, and according to Vauban citizens it is. This is part of a movement called smart planning, trying to make communities more dense and efficient, leading to a decrease in the need for private transport. Smart planning started in urban cities but has now started to spread to the originally car dominated suburbs.

The ecological effect on life without cars is one of the primary goals for towns trying to cut back on cars. The second largest greenhouse gas supplier in the world is your car's tailpipe, second only to power plants. Smog produced by cars can drastically damage living standards for residents of highly affected areas. A modern example of a city that took action in dealing with its high smog was Paris, France. Paris had the most polluted air of any western European city and placed the blame on the city's high congestion with cars. In an attempt to reduce smog and traffic, the government banned the use of cars with odd numbered license plates on one day and even numbered plates on the next and continued this trend for a week. The city implemented fines for drivers who did not respect the ban and made the city's public transportation free. Although many complained about the inconvenience, the city saw a huge drop in pollution in the air by the end of the week they were implementing the ban for, back to safe levels for its citizens. After 7 days they were able to lift the ban and return to allowing all cars to drive in the city on any day. The pollution will return in time with the ban lifted, but it has given the French and the world a preview of what life could be like with reduced reliance on cars.

Lastly the economic effect of a world without cars would massive. Many nations around the world find their economys dependent on the car. In the U.S. we have some of the largest car companies in the world contributing billions the the national economy. But less dependence on cars would mean less profit for car and oil companies. No companie ever wants to lose profit so many are turning to new fields and innovation to try to stay ahead of the transport curve. Citys like Bogota, Colombia have experemented with days totally banning cars from its streets and having citizens rely totally on alternative transport. This has created a wave of economic prosperity in the city as many new bussneses have poped up to cater to people living a car free life. Car companies now like Ford moters are taking a new bussnies plan for the years to come, trying to integrate their copanies more with a changing world of transportation.

The car may always have its place in society, but current trends show that it is on the decline. Benifits in peoples communities, environments and wallets are driving more alternative transport lifestyles to be adopted. More efficiant and shared transport is very likely to skyrocket in popularity in the decades to come and the benifits may be amasing.

**3–Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and task. A clear controlling idea (*Many places around the world today are experimenting with the possibility of life without cars and possibly providing a window into the future*) is maintained throughout the response. An evident organizational structure is used, with each of the body paragraphs providing one reason of support for the controlling idea (*The social effect, The ecological effect, the economic effect*). The brief conclusion is sufficient and helps provide a sense of completeness (*More efficient and shared transport is very likely to skyrocket in popularity in the decades to come and the benefits may be amazing*). Focus on the effects of limiting car usage is maintained. Use of a variety of transitional strategies is adequate. Each of the body paragraphs begins similarly; however, internal transitions are varied and do serve to connect ideas (*As a result, Although many complained about the inconvenience*). The progression of ideas is adequate from beginning to end (*Vauban, a town in Germany, prohibits its residents . . . As a result, the vast majority of residents there do not own a car. The streets are filled with pedestrians*). Style is appropriate.

**2–Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides adequate support for the controlling idea. Evidence from the source material is relevant and integrated. For example, in the second body paragraph, an idea is presented (*Smog produced by cars can drastically damage living standards for residents of highly affected areas*) and details from the text serve as support (*A modern example of a city that took action in dealing with its high smog was Paris*). Further elaborating on that idea, some analysis of the advantage of limiting car usage is presented (*The pollution will return in time with the ban lifted, but it has given the French and the world a preview of what life could be like with reduced reliance on cars*). The other body paragraphs are elaborated in a similar manner. An adequate expression of ideas is used throughout the response with vocabulary that is generally appropriate (*providing a window into the future of what life may be like, economic prosperity*). Sentences are varied. This response is adequate overall in the Evidence and Elaboration domain; however, without acknowledging a passage, author, or title from the passage set, the highest score a response may receive in Evidence and Elaboration is a 2.

**1–Conventions**

Overall, this draft response demonstrates a partial command of basic conventions. Numerous errors in spelling are found throughout the response (*revolutionise, interest, realising, benefits, engine*). Command of conventions is inconsistent; sentence formation is adequate, but some errors in usage (*a for an*), punctuation (missing commas and apostrophes), and capitalization (*french*) are present.

Many people believe that it is necessary to use a car to get from one place to another. Many studies have shown that this in fact is not true. There are many advantages to limiting car usage. I am in favor of limiting car usage because of the advantages it brings to the world. One reason to limit car usage is, because it reduces the amount of pollution. Another reason, is because many people around the world are in favor of limiting car usage. Lastly, limiting car usage lowers emissions and improves safety. Beneficial and critical, limiting car usage helps humans as well as the environment.

First of all, limiting car usage reduces the amount of pollution worldwide. Reflective and didactic, Robert Fuller's "Paris bans driving due to smog," reflects the amount of pollution that is reduced due to limited car usage. For example, Robert Fuller explains that "...[Last] week Paris had 147 micrograms of particulate matter (PM) per cubic meter compared with 114 in Brussels and 79.7 in London, Reuters found." This statement layers Robert's opinion that car usage can create vast amounts of pollution. If car usage is limited, the amount of particulate matter would decrease. For instance, this theory is created when Robert Fuller states "The smog cleared enough Monday for the ruling French party to rescind the ban for odd-numbered plates on Tuesday."

Another reason, is because many people around the world are in favor. Appaled and enthusiastic, Andrew Selsky's "Car-free day is spinning into a big hit in Bogota", molds the theory that limiting car usage has many advantages. For instance, businessman Carlos Arturo Plaza states "It's a good opportunity to take away stress and lower air pollution," as he rode a two-seat bicycle with his wife. The fact that many people around the world are in favor of limiting car usage is shown, when Andrew Selsky states that "Municipal authorities from other countries came to Bogota to see the event and were enthusiastic." Bogota Mayor Antanas Mockus is also in favor as he states "The rain hasn't stopped people from participating." These statements show that limiting car usage is very beneficial and has many advantages.

Lastly, limiting car usage lowers emissions and improves safety. This is shown in Elisabeth Rosenthal's "The End of Car Culture." Elisabeth states that "...it will have beneficial implications for carbon emissions and the environment." Elisabeth Rosenthal also states that "...transportation is the second largest source of America's emissions just behind power plants." Limiting car usage also improves safety. Last year in Barcelona, Spain, Bill Ford, executive chairman of the Ford has many advantages.

Motor Company, proposed partnering with telecommunications. Bill Ford wanted to partner with the telecommunications industry to create cities in which “pedestrian, bicycle, private cars, commercial and public transportation traffic are woven into a connected network to save time, conserve resources, lower emissions and improve safety.” This statement forms the theory that limiting car usage has many advantages.

In conclusion, limiting car usage has many advantages. We as people of the world need to limit car usage for many reasons. The first reason is, because it reduces the amount of pollution. The second reason is that many people around the world are in favor of limiting car usage. The last reason is, because limiting car usage lowers emissions and improves safety. This is why we as citizens of the world need to limit car usage worldwide.

**2–Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is somewhat sustained within the purpose, audience, and task. The introduction includes a controlling idea (*I am in favor of limiting car usage because of the advantages it brings to the world*) and several points (*reduces the amount of pollution, many people around the world are in favor, lowers emissions and improves safety*). Focus on the controlling idea is maintained as each body paragraph focuses on one point for limiting car usage.

Organizational structure is inconsistent, with a reliance on a formulaic approach that follows the order of the sources (first paragraph, Source 2; second paragraph, Source 3). Transitional strategies are mostly formulaic (*One reason, First of all, Another reason*). The uneven progression of ideas, which also relies heavily on a formula, is present from beginning to end (*Reflective and didactic, Robert Fuller’s “Paris bans driving” . . . Robert Fuller explains that . . . This statement layers Robert’s opinion*). A restating of the introduction weakly concludes the response.

**2–Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides cursory support or evidence for the controlling idea. Information from the source material, while referenced, is weakly integrated. Development of the information is ineffective in this response. Each body paragraph follows the same format. Instead of development of ideas, lengthy lead-ins are provided to quotations from the source material (*For instance, businessman Carlos Arturo Plaza states . . . The fact that many people around the world are in favor of limiting car usage is shown, when Andrew Selsky sates . . . Bogota Mayor Antanas Mockus is also in favor as he states*). The expression of ideas is vague and as a result does not provide any meaningful explanation. For instance, in the third body paragraph, the idea is asserted that *Limiting car usage also improves safety*, but is supported with a mostly irrelevant quote by Bill Ford that does not offer an explanation of how safety will be improved. Little variety in sentence structure is evident (*The fact that, These statements show, This is shown, This statement forms*). Attempts at more sophisticated vocabulary (*Beneficial and critical, Reflective and didactic, Appaled and enthusiastic*) do not enhance the response.

**2–Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors in spelling (*sates*) and punctuation (missing commas) do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

There are many advantages to limiting car usage. The majority of the advantages are towns that are closer together and car accidents will be much more widespread and unlikely. Only in some cases will people use cars, and in those cases it is only for doing long distance transport, such as driving across the country. The most important and final advantage is that it would reduce emissions from all cities if it is done in the major cities of the United States, and everywhere else.

The first example of the advantages that I will use is the closer together cities. We know that Germany has already made an emission free city, and you have to pay a lot of money to be able to park, or even drive. The city has closer together work places, restaurants, and stores, so it is easier for people to make a quick run to the grocery store on their walk home, rather than having to travel for 30 minutes to get to the grocery store, spend an hour there trying to get your food, and then traveling home for another 30 minutes. Overall, the closer cities with high prices to use a car will be better for our planet, and reduce emissions from many countries on the planet.

The second advantage that reducing car usage has, is that it would widely reduce the amount of accidents people have every year with cars. Bike accidents would happen more, but they would be less likely to hurt someone severely, or even take a life. This means that more lives would be saved with the use of less cars.

The final advantage is reducing emissions. If we keep moving along the pace that we were moving along when we were at our high point, Earth could end up looking like Venus much sooner than we thought. Although it may not be in our lifetime, we don't want to mess up the future for our children or grandchildren. If we do reduce emissions, and keep Earth as the "little blue dot" in our galaxy, then we are doing something great for the human race, and we should keep doing this as we move along in everything we do.

To sum everything up, if we start creating closer together cities, emissions from all vehicles will be reduced, and many less accidents will happen in which someone will be killed. Reducing emissions will save our human race in more drastic ways than we can imagine, and it would most likely help us keep our planet the way we started with it. Green, blue, and white.

**2– Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response is somewhat sustained within the purpose, audience, and task. The weak introduction includes a vague controlling idea (*There are many advantages to limiting car usage*) and three advantages to limiting car usage (*towns that are closer together and car accidents will be much more widespread, reduce emissions*). Formulaic external transitions introduce each new point (*The first example, The second advantage, The final advantage*) and the conclusion (*To sum everything up*). Internal transitional strategies are inconsistent (*Overall, Although it may not be in our lifetime*). Progression of ideas is uneven (*Bike accidents would happen more, This means that more lives would be saved*). A loss in focus, especially in the third body paragraph, introduces extraneous material (*Earth could end up looking like Venus*). An inadequate conclusion briefly summarizes the response.

**1– Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides minimal support or evidence for the controlling idea. The first body paragraph alludes to Source 1 (*We know that Germany has already made an emission free city*), but without citation or more depth of development (*The city has closer together work places, restaurants, and stores*), the information is confusing. The advantages of limiting car usage in the second and third body paragraphs are not source based. Development in the second body paragraph is somewhat confusing and therefore ineffective (*widely reduce the amount of accidents people have every year with cars. Bike accidents would happen more . . . less likely to hurt someone severely . . . This means that more lives would be saved*). The third body paragraph is a vague list of what will happen if emissions are reduced (*Earth could end up looking like Venus, keep Earth as the “little blue dot,” keep doing this*), but fails to tie in ways to reduce emissions from the source material. Vocabulary is sometimes inappropriate (*mess up*) or repetitive (*from all cities, major cities, closer together cities, closer cities*).

**2–Conventions**

The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. Minor errors in spelling (*emmissions*) and usage (*less*) do not detract from the overall adequacy of this draft response.

I think that limiting car usage would be something good. My reason is for less car accidents. Many people drive reckless and speed and this is what causes these car accidents. We can save alot of people from getting injured in car accidents.

In this case we can also save traffic and causing people to be late to their jobs. This is why we should limit them also because of the gas rate. In this way we can save alot of money. Gas has been really expensive and this case we can save money and cause less accidents.

Nobody is willing to keep driving to stay safe and save gas money. "70 percent of vaubans families do not own cars and 57 percent sold their cars". I think that limiting this car usage would be a good thing for all of us. We would just have to find a safer way to get transportation.

In other ways alot of people drive around drunk and they cause alot of car accidents. This is something that is not fair for us innocent drivers. We would just have to find a new way to get us all transportation. Driving is something pretty dangerous though cause their really is alot of crazy drivers out their.

**1– Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response demonstrates little awareness of purpose or task and has little discernible organizational structure. A vague controlling idea begins the response (*I think that limiting car usage would be something good*). The response lacks transitional strategies to connect the list of ideas, and no conclusion is provided. While the response does stay slightly focused on the positives of limiting car usage (*less car accidents, save alot of money*), some confusion in the ideas is present (*In other ways alot of people drive around drunk and they cause alot of car accidents, Driving is something pretty dangerous though cause their really is alot of crazy drivers out their*).

**1– Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides minimal support or evidence for the controlling idea. Information from the source material is limited to one standalone quotation (“*70 percent of vaubans families do not own cars and 57 percent sold their cars*”). No attempt is made to integrate the information, and, taken out of context, the relevance of Vauban is unclear. Support for the controlling idea is primarily information from outside the source material and repetitive (*My reason is for less car accidents, We can save alot of people from getting injured in car accidents, they cause alot of car accidents*). Lack of development or specificity leads to an expression of ideas that is, at times, confusing (*we can also save traffic and causing people to be late to their jobs.*) Vocabulary is simplistic (*something good, a good thing*), and sentence variety is limited (*I think that, My reason is, This is why, Nobody is*).

**1–Conventions**

Although some errors are present in usage (*their* for *there*, *causing* for *cause*), punctuation (missing commas), and sentence formation, the response demonstrates a partial command of basic conventions. The conventions of spelling, capitalization, and end punctuation are generally followed in this draft response.

S-10

Score Point 1/1/0

(page 1 of 2)

cars have many flaws and in this day and age some are trying to get rid of them. in some ways that could be the answer to our pollution problem but cars are still too important to get rid of. limiting car usage could be the answer. that's good cuz it gets u time to exercise, decreases our pollution problem, and gives us a chance to enjoy life better instead of speeding through life with cars.

cars today is one of our leading problems of pollution and global warming. the decrease of car usage will help the environment. we fill our cars with diesel fuel which make up 67 percent in a city such as Paris, France with a great population. after days of near record pollution, Paris enforced a partial driving ban to clear the air of the global city.

exercise is really good for your health. such as walking, riding a bike, or even jogging. anything instead of using a car maybe instead of taking your car to work how about walking to the nearest bus stop. instead of taking ur child to school let them ride the bike to school.

**1–Purpose/Focus/Organization**

The response demonstrates little awareness of purpose or task and has little discernible organizational structure. A controlling idea is stated (*it gets u time to exercise,decreases our polution problem,and gives us a chance to enjoy life better instead of speeding through life withy cars*). Transitional strategies are not used to connect ideas. Extraneous ideas (*exercise is raelly good for your health, instead of taking ur child to school let them ride the bike to school*), while meant to support the controlling idea, demonstrate a loss of focus and a lack of awareness of purpose to inform citizens about the advantages of limiting car usage; one must infer that *walking,riding a bike, or even jogging* are taking the place of driving a car. This response also lacks a conclusion.

**1–Evidence/Elaboration**

The response provides minimal support or evidence for the controlling idea. Copied information from the source material (*deisel fuel wich make up 67percent in a city such as paris,france with a great population*) is not developed or cited and does not support the controlling idea. Support, not from the sources, is limited to a list of alternatives to driving (*instead of taking your car to work how about walking to the nearest bus stop*). As no clear connection to the controlling idea or the source material is made, advantages to limiting car usage can only be inferred. Expression of ideas is vague and confusing (*cars have many flaws . . . but cars or still too important to get rid of*). Vocabulary is at times inappropriate (*cuz*) and sentence variety is lacking (*cars have, cars today, we fill, exercise is*).

**0–Conventions**

This draft response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions. Errors include missing capital letters to begin sentences, missing apostrophes (*thats*), sentence fragments (*such as walking,riding a bike, or even jogging*), and spelling (*polution, enviorment, raelly*). Usage errors are frequent (*cars today is, cuz, u, ur*).

