High School – Argumentative Writing Work Sample: Meets

Task: Your class is studying about computer technology and development. You are given five resources about 3-D printers and how copyright, patent, and trademark law apply to 3D printers.

*Read the sources carefully to **write an argumentative essay** supporting or opposing the school library getting a 3D printer for students to use. Make sure to address potential counterarguments in your essay and support your claim with information from the sources you have examined.*

Scores, Justification of Student Evidence, and Suggested Areas of Student Improvement

Ideas and Content: 4

The essay presents a clear claim opposing the school library getting a 3D printer and maintains this position consistently throughout. The writer uses multiple sources, provides relevant reasons (library purpose/mission, legal risks, intellectual property concerns, and threats to creativity), and includes a counterargument section. Explanations are generally clear, though sometimes overstated, and not all reasoning is fully developed. Some misconceptions about legal risk appear, and the essay occasionally relies on emotional or exaggerated statements rather than precise evidence. Nonetheless, the core argument is strong, source-based, and purposeful.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Ideas and Content
✓ **Clear, Defensible Claim** ○ Opens with a firm stance: "Although the library is a great place to learn about technology, there is no need for ours to have a 3-D printer." ○ Maintains this claim consistently across the essay.	➢
✓ **Relevant, Well-Selected Reasons** ○ Library mission mismatch: Draws heavily on Source #5 to argue that 3D printing is outside the purpose of a library. ▪ Quote: "Tying your library to something like a 3D printer moves you in the wrong direction… that's not your job." ○ Not a manufacturing company: Uses logical reasoning to argue the library should not provide "expensive services" like printing tangible objects. ○ Threat to creativity: Argues that easy copying undermines originality.	➢ **Elaborate on the Mission-Based Argument** ○ Add specifics explaining why 3D printing distracts from the library's mission using clearer connections to Source 5.
✓ **Use of Multiple Sources** ○ Source 5 (Mission Creep) is used prominently and appropriately to support the claim. ○ Source 4 (Penrose Triangle case) used effectively to argue the danger of theft and misattribution. ○ Source 2/3 (legal copying issues) referenced partially when discussing "illegal copying" and copyright/patent penalties. ○ Demonstrates a good range of evidence.	➢ **Strengthen Economic and Practical Evidence** ○ Include details from Source 1 about operational policies and limitations that affect risk and cost.
✓ **Counterargument Addressed** ○ Acknowledges that "in some ways, a 3D printer can seem necessary," but rebuts it by explaining why it "has no place in a library."	➢ **Deepen the Counterargument Section** ○ Briefly acknowledge specific benefits from other sources (innovation, customization) before rebutting them.

Evidence from Student Work: Ideas and Content	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Ideas and Content
✓ **Reasoning Is Mostly Solid but Sometimes Overgeneralized** ○ Overstates legal risk to the library ("we could end up in serious trouble," "many people could end up being sued") without clarifying that Source 3 explains most 3D-printed objects are not protected. ○ The creativity argument uses hypothetical extremes ("print a Michelangelo sculpture") not supported by sources. ○ Some emotional language weakens the explanatory force.	➢ **Clarify the Legal Reasoning Using Accurate Source Information** ○ Revise statements about lawsuits and penalties to reflect what Source 3 actually explains about patents and what is/not protected. ➢ **Reduce Exaggeration in the Creativity Argument** ○ Replace extreme scenarios (Michelangelo sculptures) with source-based examples or more plausible reasoning.
✓ **Explanation Depth Varies** ○ Strong development around the role of the library but limited detail about actual 3D-printer misuse policies that could mitigate risk (Source 1).	➢

Organization: 4

The essay follows a clear argumentative structure with a purposeful introduction, logically organized body paragraphs grouped by reason, and a conclusion that reinforces the position. Transitions are functional, and sequencing generally supports clarity. Some internal paragraph shifts could be smoother, and the counterargument is underdeveloped, but overall the organization aligns well with grade-level expectations.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Organization
✓ **Clear Introduction Establishes Claim and Purpose** ○ States the stance directly and frames the essay as a justification of why a 3D printer is unnecessary in the school library.	➢
✓ **Logical Sequencing of Reasons** ○ Moves from library mission to legal concerns to creativity concerns to conclusion. ○ Each major idea is separated into its own paragraph.	➢
✓ **Functional Transitions** ○ Uses transitions such as "For example," "Also," "In some ways," which support readability. ○ Some transitions are basic but effective.	➢ **Use More Purposeful Transitions** ○ Use transitions that signal relationships (such as "In contrast," "However," "More importantly") to highlight argumentative moves.
✓ **Effective Paragraph Boundaries** ○ The paragraph on intellectual property (Penrose triangle example) is distinct and internally coherent.	➢ **Tighten Paragraph Focus** ○ Ensure each paragraph develops one clear idea especially the creativity paragraph, which currently includes multiple loosely related claims.
✓ **Conclusion Provides Closure** ○ Reiterates the claim and underscores the key reasoning: "This is not the time for our school to go on a spending spree… It has no place in a library."	➢ **Improve Conclusion With Synthesis** ○ Summarize how all reasons (mission, legal concerns, creativity) connect rather than restating them.

Evidence from Student Work: Organization	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Organization
✓ **Minor Organizational Weaknesses** ○ Counterargument paragraph is brief and not integrated with source-based support. ○ Creativity paragraph contains loosely connected ideas that could be more tightly organized.	➢ **Strengthen the Counterargument Structure** ○ Add a specific source-based benefit before rebutting to create a more balanced, sophisticated organization.

Voice: 4

The voice is confident, committed to the position, and generally appropriate for an academic argument. The writer uses an authoritative tone and demonstrates clear investment in the issue. At times, however, the voice becomes overly forceful or emotional, drifting slightly away from academic precision.

Evidence from Student Work: Voice	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Voice
✓ **Confident and Purposeful Tone** ○ Strong opening stance shows clear conviction. ○ Uses assertive statements like "There is no need for ours to have a 3-D printer."	➢ **Clarify Academic Rationale** ○ Explain instead of assert when making claims about creativity or misuse.
✓ **Appropriate Audience Awareness** ○ Frames concerns relevant to a school community costs, purpose, creativity, and legal risk.	➢ **Strengthen Audience Focus** ○ Make references that directly consider administrators, librarians, or the school board as the intended audience.
✓ **Clear Sense of Authorial Presence** ○ The writer's viewpoint is clear without being overly personal.	➢
✓ **Moments of Overstatement** ○ Phrases like "this will force students to be less creative" or "we could end up in serious trouble" reduce objectivity.	➢ **Increase Evidence-Based Voice** ○ Let source material anchor the tone rather than personal predictions.
✓ **Occasional Emotional Wording** ○ "Not the time to go on a spending spree" feels more rhetorical than academic. ○ Creativity concerns are presented more as fear-based statements than evidence-backed analysis.	➢ **Reduce Overly Forceful or Emotional Language** ○ Modify phrases like "serious trouble" and "spending spree" to maintain academic tone.

Word Choice: 4

Word choice is generally precise, purposeful, and appropriate for an academic argument. The writer uses effective argumentative vocabulary and integrates quoted material naturally. Some overgeneralizations and emotionally charged words appear, but overall lexical control is solid.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Word Choice
✓ **Precise Language When Discussing Sources** ○ Uses terms like "unintended propagation," "illegal copying," "manufacturing company," "expensive," "copyright infringement."	➢ **Maintain Consistent Formality** ○ Replace conversational tone (e.g., "spending spree") with neutral, informative phrasing.

Evidence from Student Work: Word Choice	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Word Choice
✓ **Effective Quoting and Paraphrasing** ○ Integrates Source 5's phrasing accurately: "Tying your library to something like a 3D printer moves you in the wrong direction."	➢
✓ **Occasional Vague or Overstated Language** ○ "Force students to be less creative," "serious trouble," "spending spree." ○ Some claims lack precise definitions.	➢ **Replace Overstated Phrases With Precise Terms** ○ Use specific legal or educational terminology instead of general emotional language. ➢ **Clarify Ambiguous Claims** ○ Define what "less creative" means and tie it to source evidence.
✓ **Appropriate Formality Most of the Time** ○ Uses academic vocabulary suited for a research-based argument.	➢ **Strengthen Lexical Precision** ○ Use more discipline-specific vocabulary related to IP law or library purpose.

Sentence Fluency: 4

Sentences are clear, varied, and well-constructed. Flow is generally smooth with effective pacing. A few sentences rely on simple constructions or include slightly awkward phrasing, but overall sentence fluency is strong.

Evidence from Student Work: Sentence Fluency	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Sentence Fluency
✓ **Varied Sentence Structures** ○ Uses both complex and simple sentences effectively.	➢ **Increase Sentence Variety in Key Paragraphs** ○ Add introductory clauses or adverbial openers to vary rhythm.
✓ **Smooth Transitions Between Ideas** ○ Paragraphs connect logically and flow with minimal disruption.	➢ **Refine Abrupt or Blunt Sentences** ○ Smooth transitions within sentences to maintain flow.
✓ **Mostly Controlled Rhythm and Pacing** ○ Examples are introduced smoothly, such as the Penrose triangle case.	➢ **Revise Emotionally Driven Constructions** ○ Rework sentences for clarity and neutrality.
✓ **Minor Awkwardness** ○ Some sentences become blunt or abrupt, especially when emotionally charged ("This is not the time for a spending spree").	➢ **Use More Sophisticated Linking Structures** ○ Integrate cause/effect or concession-connectors in the counterargument.
✓ **Generally Strong Clarity** ○ Sentences are readable and grammatically sound.	➢

Conventions: 5

The writing demonstrates strong control of grammar, punctuation, sentence boundaries, and spelling. Errors are infrequent, and none interfere with meaning. Some minor punctuation refinements could improve clarity, but command of conventions is consistently evident.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Conventions
✓ **Correct Grammar and Syntax** ○ Sentences are well-formed with clear subjects and predicates.	➢ **Maintain Strong Editing Practices** ○ Continue proofreading for clarity and flow.

Evidence from Student Work: Conventions	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Conventions
✓ **Accurate Spelling and Punctuation** ○ No noticeable spelling errors. ○ Punctuation used well in complex sentences.	➢ **Refine Minor Punctuation Choices** ○ Consider readability when deciding where commas enhance clarity.
✓ **Clear Sentence Boundaries** ○ No run-on sentences or fragments.	➢
✓ **Minor Refinements Possible** ○ Occasional comma might aid fluency but does not affect correctness.	➢ **Review Comma Placement in Longer Sentences** ○ Add commas to improve readability in a few multi-clause structures.

Use of Sources: 4

The essay uses multiple sources effectively and accurately. Evidence is well integrated, though attribution could be more explicit in places. Some claims overextend the sources or misinterpret legal implications, but overall the writer demonstrates clear engagement with the text set.

Evidence from Student Work: Use of Sources	Student Recommendations for Improvement: Use of Sources
✓ **Accurate Use of Source 5 (Mission Focus)** ○ Strongly rooted argument that 3D printing is outside the library's core mission. ○ Well-chosen quotation strengthens the argument.	➢ **Provide More Balanced Integration of Sources** ○ Add examples from Source 2 about customization and innovation before rebutting them.
✓ **Correct Use of Source 4 (Penrose Triangle Case)** ○ Explains file-sharing issues and potential for misattribution. ○ Appropriately connected to concerns about students copying designs without permission.	➢
✓ **Partial, Less Accurate Use of Legal Sources (2 and 3)** ○ Writer suggests lawsuits are likely but does not reflect Source 3's explanation that most objects are not protected by patent/copyright.	➢ **Clarify Legal Reasoning Using Source 3** ○ Explain what is actually protected and correct statements that exaggerate lawsuit likelihood.
✓ **Limited Use of Source 1** ○ Does not mention library policies that reduce risk (permission requirements, deletion, staff mediation).	➢ **Use Source 1 to Strengthen Practical Considerations** ○ Reference specific library policy restrictions that support your argument.
✓ **No Factual Errors in Quoted Evidence** ○ Quoted text from Source 5 is accurate.	➢ **Increase Explicit Attribution** ○ Use clear signal phrases to attribute evidence consistently.
✓ **Some Unsupported Inferences** ○ Suggests students could be sued, though sources state enforcement is difficult and often inapplicable.	➢

Suggestions for Teaching Strategies to Support the Student Sample:

The following contain suggestions for teaching strategies and do not encompass a complete list of possible strategies.

Ideas and Content:

Legal Reasoning Accuracy Mini-Lesson

- Teach students how to match claims to correct source evidence when writing about copyright and patents.

Counterargument-Rebuttal Modeling

- Show students how to introduce a counterargument using evidence, then rebut it clearly with source-based reasoning.

Precision vs. Exaggeration Workshop

- Practice revising extreme or hypothetical statements into source-grounded, credible arguments.

Role-of-the-Library Concept Mapping

- Help students connect Source 5's ideas to their argumentative claims more explicitly and analytically.

Organization:

Counterargument Organization Lesson

- Teach how to structure full counterclaim → evidence → rebuttal paragraphs.

Transition Function Mini-Lesson

- Provide a transition chart that aligns specific logical relationships with sentence starters.

Paragraph Purpose Mapping

- Have students identify the purpose of each paragraph and adjust when multiple purposes appear in one paragraph.

Voice:

Tone Calibration Using Mentor Texts

- Compare portions of the essay with more formal argumentative examples.

Academic Voice Mini-Lessons

- Practice revising emotional statements into evidence-grounded analysis.

Audience Lens Revision

- Students revise a paragraph for an audience of school policymakers.

Suggestions for Teaching Strategies to Support the Student Sample:

The following contain suggestions for teaching strategies and do not encompass a complete list of possible strategies.

Word Choice:

Replace-and-Refine Word Choice Activity

- Students practice revising emotionally loaded statements to neutral academic language.

Vocabulary Precision Workshop

- Build lists of legal/educational terms to enhance argumentative clarity.

Source Vocabulary Integration

- Teach students how to incorporate vocabulary from the texts in accurate, discipline-appropriate ways.

Sentence Fluency:

Sentence Variety Mini-Lessons

- Practice transforming sentences into new structures.

Fluency Read-Aloud Routine

- Students identify places where phrasing disrupts flow.

Complex Sentence Construction Practice

- Teach students how to embed clauses to add sophistication.

Conventions:

Advanced Conventions Exercises

- Focus on nuanced punctuation for rhetorical effect.

Peer Editing Stations

- Students check one another's work for minor convention refinements.

Proofreading Checklists

- Support continued accuracy with structured revision routines.

Use of Sources:

Source Accuracy Routine

- Students cross-check claims against source passages to avoid misinterpretations.

Balanced Source Integration Lessons

- Model how to use supporting and opposing evidence before rebutting.

Attribution Phrase Practice

- Have students embed source titles or numbers in varied signal phrases.