

College Cost | Annotation Letters to the Next President Anchor 1

	Employs a Public Voice	Advocates Civic Engagement	Argues a Position Based on Reasoning & Evidence	Employs a Structure
<p>Topic: College Cost</p> <p>Form: Public Letter</p> <p>Media: Text</p> <p>URL: https://letters2president.org/letters/3438</p>	<p>Score 1 The writing:</p> <p>Employs rhetorical strategies that are mostly ineffective. For example, the list of broad platitudes at the end (“<i>But it also depends on human beings to know the differences of the good from the bad.</i>”) undermine the purpose of convincing a presidential audience to support free college tuition. Writing attempts to appeal to audience by highlighting value of hard work, but although mentioned, value is not fostered by vague call to action. “<i>It is our decision to fight and keep fighting to get ahead anyway no matter what, but my hypothesis is not ruled out...</i>”</p> <p>Undermines writer’s credibility through inaccuracies sentence structure (“<i>There are also many young people attending to a university but with much effort.</i>”) and in language use (“<i>very exaggerated and elevated</i>”). The inaccuracies in sentence structure at times obscure the intended message.</p>	<p>Score 1 The writing:</p> <p>Fails to establish the public importance of the high cost of college. However, the writing does hint at why this is an important issue by making a connection between the high cost of college and homelessness (“<i>For the same reason that education is very expensive it is that there are several young people in the streets, because they see education is very unattainable and choose other paths more ‘accessible’.</i>”) This is not sufficient to raise the score to a 2.</p> <p>Does not articulate why this solution (“<i>Tuition should be a gift from the government.</i>”) represents a feasible approach to addressing the problem (“<i>Only a minority are able to afford college.</i>”).</p>	<p>Score 1 The writing:</p> <p>Uses very limited reasoning to support the idea of free college tuition. The two sentences in the middle of the piece that lay out a value and one clear reason for government paying for tuition (“<i>I think that education should not be paid, should be a gift from the government and should be free for all. If a country has more population with education then the country will prosper and and generate more income...</i>”) is not sufficient to raise the score above a 1. The writing implicitly demonstrates a value for the importance of education, but the reasoning that links this to the suggested action is limited.</p> <p>Lists information without interpretation or with flawed interpretations (“<i>For the same reason that education is very expensive it is that there are several young people in the streets, because they see education very unattainable and choose other paths more ‘accessible’.</i>”) Provides insufficient evidence to support some of the claims made (“<i>If a country has more population with education then the country will prosper more and generate more income, because people have something to contribute to the country with their knowledge and their proficiency.</i>”).</p>	<p>Score 1 The writing:</p> <p>Employs an organization that is a listing of loosely connected content, although there is evidence of an attempt at a problem solution organization. The first four sentences nominally outline the problem, sentence five presents a solution.</p> <p>Presents an opening and closing that are disconnected from call to civic engagement. The closure is inappropriate because it is so generic that it serves to obscure the call to action: “<i>This problem must have a solution and I hope that you as President find the best solution.</i>”</p> <p>Includes ideas few links among ideas (“<i>For the same reason that education is very expensive it is that there are several young people in the streets, because they see education very unattainable and choose other paths more ‘accessible’.</i>”).</p>