

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE A \* SCORE 4

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

Did you know that people with disabilities are limited to the kind of service animals they can have in public places? In March 2011, this new rule was added to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) so that only dogs and miniature horses are allowed. I strongly agree with this new rule, and there are multiple reasons why.

First off, and most importantly, if any kind of animal was allowed to be a service animal, it could be a danger to people and other animals. People could bring all kinds of dangerous animals with them in public places like porcupines, cobras, tigers, or gorillas. In Source #1 it states "For example, a monkey could suddenly hurt a person if it got angry or frightened for some reason." According to April Truitt who works for the Primate Resuce Center "...it is possible for capuchins to become violent suddenly and this can be a danger to their owners and others." Business owners cannot have animals in their public places who hurt others or become violent suddenly and that is why not every kind of animal should be allowed as a service animal. In Source #3 it says

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response provides thorough and convincing evidence supporting the opinion that only dogs and miniature horses should be allowed as service animals in public places.

There is clear integration of the source material to support the opinion, and the student even includes a statement to note the credibility of an expert from the article: "According to April Truitt who works for the Primate Resuce Center . . ." In addition, comprehensive evidence is provided to support the idea that other service animals should not be included in this law. The student claims that other service animals "could be a danger to people and other animals," and then provides cited quotations in support of this opinion: "... a monkey could suddenly hurt a person . . ." and "... it is possible for capuchins to become violent suddenly and this can be a danger to their owners and others." The student further supports the opinion by citing that "Dogs and miniature horses . . . can be trusted by pet owners and businners owners." The spread of disease is also discussed as a reason why other

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

“Dogs and miniature horses, however, are tame. They have been used as pets for hundreds of years. They listen to commands. Both dogs and miniature horses are trained to guide the blind. These animals can be trusted by pet owners and business owners.” This is why only dogs and miniature horses should be allowed in public places. They are not dangerous to people and other animals.

Secondly, if other kinds of animals are allowed to be service animals, there could be diseases spread in a place of business. In Source #3 it states “For example, birds could leave droppings on a store floor. This creates an unhealthy setting for others.” If these birds leave their poop on the floor, it will mean business owners have to be very careful to clean up the mess so that people going there don’t get sick. It also says in Source #3 that “Different animals carry certain diseases.” If people are allowed to bring in pigs, birds, and lizards, those animals can spread diseases to other customers. Dogs and miniature horses are tame pets and would not spread disease the way these other animals could.

Business owners would be hurt if they were allowed to have all types of service animals enter their place of business.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

service animals are not ideal to have in public places. The student cites that “. . . birds could leave droppings . . . creat[ing] an unhealthy setting,” and adds to it with “Different animals carry certain diseases.” All of the evidence used is relevant, specific, and integrated into the response, with multiple pieces of evidence used to support each facet of the opinion.

Elaborative techniques are effectively used throughout the response. For example, in paragraph 2, the student quotes two statements from Source #1 and then uses that information to infer that “Business owners cannot have animals in their public places who hurt others or become violent suddenly and that is why not every kind of animal should be allowed as a service animal.” The student uses the same strategy at the end of paragraph 2, stating, “. . . dogs and miniature horses . . . are not dangerous to people and other animals.” The student sandwiches quotations effectively throughout the response by introducing the quotation, stating the quotation, and concluding with an explanation of how the quotation provides support for the overall opinion. In addition, the student provides an elaborative paragraph about how business owners would be impacted if all types of service animals were allowed.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

Animals who are a danger to people and other animals could become violent and hurt other people who come to that place of business. These business owners could be sued. Also, there are laws in place about keeping a restaurant clean so that food can be served there and people don't get sick. Without the new service animal law, people could bring all types of animals who carry and spread diseases. These business owners could have their restaurants shut down and have to pay fines to reopen. In conclusion, I strongly believe that ONLY DOGS AND MINIATURE HORSES should be allowed to work as service animals in public places. Other types of animals can be dangerous and spread diseases. These are huge reasons why this new rule is the best. We must protect people and businesses.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

The style used is effective and helps to enhance the content of the writing. The student uses terms appropriate to opinion writing, such as "I strongly agree . . .," "I strongly believe . . .," and ". . . there are multiple reasons why." Most of the vocabulary used is clearly appropriate for audience and purpose; however, at times the language could be more precise—for example, in the sentence "These are huge reasons why this new rule is the best."

### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
<b>EVIDENCE/ELABORATION</b>	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE B \* SCORE 3

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

I disagree with the rule that only service dogs and miniature horses should be allowed in public places. Other animals can help people and it's not fair that they can't be let out in public. If the animal hurts someone then it shouldn't be in public, but only that one animal, not it's whole species.

The first reason I disagree with this rule, is what did the other service animals do? What did these other animals like service monkeys or service snakes ever do? They are trained to help, not to hurt. And it's not fair to the human or the animal that they can't be in public just because people think that they might be dangerous. These animals can be trained. Monkeys spend a long time around humans before they even get trained. They also spend time around pets. It says in source #1, "They get used to being around pets." They didn't hurt that pet.

Another reason that I disagree with this rule is, that monkeys are good pets. If someone with a disability wanted to take their "pet" monkey with them down to a coffee shop and they were stopped, that wouldn't be fair at all It says in source #1 that, ". . . monkeys are ready to go live with someone who needs them to help make life a little bit easier." If a person with a disability

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response provides adequate evidence and elaboration regarding the opinion that animals besides just dogs and miniature horses should be allowed as service animals in public places.

There is adequate citation of the source material, and the evidence provided is relevant and integrated. The first cited quotation explains how monkeys adjust to being around other pets. The other two quoted details in the subsequent paragraphs provide additional relevant evidence from the source material about how monkeys help make life easier for people. All three pieces of evidence cited and used in this response adequately support this student's opinion that more types of animals than just dogs and miniature horses should be allowed in public as service animals.

There is also adequate use of elaborative techniques explaining why the selected evidence supports the claim. For example, in paragraph 4, the student quotes the source, noting, ". . . Assistance animals like this capuchin monkey are smart and nimble enough to help in lots of ways . . ." and then provides an interpretation, stating, "So if someone

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5

wanted help with something at the coffee shop and their monkey or snake or even lizard couldn't come, they would be sad. that their loving "pet" couldn't go with them. .

The final reason that I disagree with that rule is, people need their service animals. If a person needed help at some place like a grocery store and they couldn't have their animal, they'll probably have trouble getting their shopping done. . It says in source #2 that, ". . . Assistance animals like this capuchin monkey are smart and nimble enough to help in lots of ways . . ." So if someone needed help and had to have their service animal and couldn't reach something on a high shelf, it would be really hard for them.

In conclusion, I do not agree with this rule for many reasons. People agree with it but have they thought that, this isn't fair to people. They need these animals and if they can't have them in public, it will be really hard for them. And I hope that you can agree with me.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5

needed help and had to have their service animal and couldn't reach something on a high shelf, it would be really hard for them." The student consistently cites the significant benefit that the capuchin monkey provides, and then explains why it would be important for people to be able to use the capuchin monkey as a service animal.

The vocabulary and style used are generally appropriate for audience and purpose. The student engages the reader by asking questions, such as ". . . what did the other service animals do?" and "What did these other animals like service monkeys or service snakes ever do?" In addition, the student uses terms appropriate to opinion writing, such as "disagree" and "it's not fair." The overall language in the response could be more precise and descriptive. For example, there is an overreliance on the pronoun "they" in paragraph 2, which makes the writing unclear.

Holistically, this response demonstrates adequate use of evidence and elaborative techniques and earns a score of 3.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE C \* SCORE 3

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

I agree with the rule to have only dogs and miniature horses as service animals. This rule is to only keep us and the animals safe. And to do that there has to be certain rules to maintane. Some animals can be dangerous to us and to themselves.

To keep us safe some rules are greatly needed. Some animals are dangerous and cannot be trained, and if brought in our presence may get angry. It says in source one, “. . . it is possible for capuchans to become violent suddenly . . .” These monkeys can be dangerous to have in a public place. However, it says in source three, “Dogs and miniature horses, however, are tame.” If only these dogs and miniature horses are used as service animals, they can be trained because tame animals can be taught to follow commands. This shows that some other animals can be dangerous.

One other reason is that animals can spread diseases. Where as most dogs and horses don't have those diseases. It says in source three, “Different animals carry certain diseases.” This shows that some animals are unsafe. And usually other animals can carry aids.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 9

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response is on the lower end of a 3 for Organization and Purpose.

This response provides adequate evidence and elaboration regarding the opinion that only dogs and miniature horses should be allowed as service animals.

While there is adequate citation of the source material, the evidence provided is not comprehensive. Quoted details provide relevant, but only generally connected, evidence to the topics discussed in support of the opinion. The student provides multiple supporting pieces of evidence in paragraph 2 about training animals so that they do not become dangerous. Paragraphs 3 and 4 appropriately cite details about how different animals carry different diseases and how some animals may cause damage, but these details are only generally connected to the topics noted.

There is adequate use of elaborative techniques to explain why the selected evidence supports the student's claim. For example, in paragraph 2, the student quotes multiple sources, noting that “. . . it

CONTINUED ON PAGE 9



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

Finally animals are hard to predict what they are going to do. **And that is not always a good quality.** It may lead to an animal **attack** or severe injuries. It says in source three, “Others might cause damage or have special needs.” This shows that some animals are not suitable for taking care of a person.

As you can see most animals are suitable for work. And dogs and miniature horses are the best choice. You can get injured by a different animal, but dogs are great companions. **So I think this rule should stay.** And it will probably decrease the amount of injuries.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

is possible for capuchans to become violent suddenly . . .” and “Dogs and miniature horses, however, are tame.” This evidence is followed by an interpretation: “This shows that some other animals can be dangerous.” In the subsequent two paragraphs, the student elaborates on the quotations selected, with uneven effectiveness. For example, in paragraph 3, the student cites source 3, writing “Different animals carry certain diseases;” followed by the explanation, “This shows that some animals are unsafe. And usually other animals can carry aids.” There is an overgeneralized statement made about some animals being unsafe, with no clarity about which animals.

The vocabulary used is generally appropriate for audience and purpose and demonstrates a mix of precise language and more general language. The student notes that there must be “rules to maintane” with the use of service animals. In addition, the student states that animals can be “dangerous” and can “spread diseases” or “attack”—all appropriate vocabulary connected to the concept of the issues that service animals can create. Some vocabulary is general and could be more precise, such as “not always a good quality” and “So I think this rule should stay.”

Holistically, this response demonstrates adequate use of evidence and elaboration/development of ideas.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE D \* SCORE 3

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

I disagree with only being able to use dogs and miniture horses. If you just use them then you wouldn't be able to pick things up easily if you had spinal issues.

First, If you didn't have the capuchin monkeys you wouldn't be able to pick stuff up easily. According to source #1, "Their hands can easily cary small tools. This makes it easier for them to handle modern items such as remotes and cell phones." For people living with injuries to their spinal cordthis would help so much.

Second, If you didn't have a snake or a comforting animal then you could become an insane maniac. If you took that away a lot of people would become mentally insane. In source #3 it saya. "A man has a large snake draped over his sholders. He wants to enter a café for lunch and says the snake is a service animal that helps and comforts him."

Third, When you take all of what I just said back, what would you have? When you take that away you have nothing is because you are making people with spinal and comforting issues not have their companionship with his or her animal.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response provides adequate evidence and elaboration regarding the opinion that more than just dogs and miniature horses should be allowed to be service animals.

There is adequate attribution of the source material, with relevant evidence integrated from Source #1 and Source #3. For example, in paragraph 2, the student notes the dexterity of the capuchin monkey and then provides a quote from the source to support the statement: "Their hands can easily cary small tools. This makes it easier for them to handle modern items such as remotes and cell phones."

In paragraph 3, the evidence "A man . . . says the snake is a service animal that helps and comforts him" provides further support for the student's opinion that other service animals should be accepted.

There is uneven use of elaborative techniques to explain how the selected evidence supports the claim. In the second paragraph, the student discusses that "if you didn't have the capuchin monkeys you wouldn't be able to pick stuff up easily." This is followed by a quote about how monkeys can use remotes and cell phones and a brief

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 11

This shows that some people need their companions, and that people should be able to bring service animals in public.

Finally, From my perspective I disagree with those laws. I think that if there is a ton of injuries they should train the animals better.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 11

explanation of how people with spinal cord injuries would benefit from this particular service animal. The third paragraph states that someone could become an “insane maniac” without a service animal and then provides a cited quotation about a man who believes that his service snake comforts him. However, the student does not provide an explanation of how snakes can calm some people, and the reader is forced to make the leap between the detail and the explanation. Paragraph 4 is an elaboration of the evidence presented throughout the response; it is very unclear and relies heavily on personal interpretation not connected to any evidence or source material.

The vocabulary used is generally appropriate for audience and purpose. The student uses the terms “spinal and comforting issues” to expand upon the idea of people who may need to use service animals for “companionship.” In addition, the terms “disagree” and “perspective” are used to strengthen the opinions. The student also uses some terms that are less appropriate, such as “insane maniac.”

Holistically, this response is a low 3 as a result of its adequate use of evidence combined with uneven use of elaborative techniques.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE E \* SCORE 2

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

Today, I was asked to pick a side about the new service animal rules and regulations. I **strongly believe** that the new rules are **better, more safe, and more helpful** compared to the old rules. Let me explain why.

It specifically states in source 3 lines 15-25 that, **“people were allowed to choose any service animal as helpers, including pigs, birds, and lizards!”** So, does that mean that if I were disabled, I could have a Gila Monster? Pretty much – Yes. The new laws prohibit anything that dangerous happening, because the animals have been limited to dogs and small horses.

Let me add on to how dangerous it is to have **a pet snake or lizard**. I get that it **might make the disabled person feel comfy and cozy**. But if you brought a snake or other creature into, let’s say, a coffee shop, **how would that make passerby feel? Probably not so good.**

Also, there is always the possibility of the service animal attacking. If you get attacked by a dog, no big deal. Now, let’s pretend that the dog is now a snake attacking. You could possibly die (I am not using snakes for any particular reason).

CONTINUED ON PAGE 15

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This paper provides uneven and cursory support for the opinion. There is insufficient use of source material.

The only evidence the student uses is from Source #3, included in paragraph 2 (“people were allowed . . .”). This limited evidence describes what kinds of animals were previously allowed under the old laws and does not act to support this student’s opinion that only dogs and miniature horses should be allowed as service animals. No other evidence is provided.

The student does discuss two details from the sources: “a pet snake or lizard . . . might make the disabled person feel comfy and cozy” and “There is no way in knowing if that monkey is going to attack or not,” and uses elaborative techniques to explain these details. There is inclusion of many other elaborative techniques throughout the response, but they serve to weaken, rather than strengthen, the student’s opinion, as there is an overreliance on personal opinions and interpretation. For example, the student states, “I personally would love to hear the other side of the story because right now, there is nothing that could change my mind.”

CONTINUED ON PAGE 14



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 14

This is what really gives me the chills. Let's say, a paralyzed man has a pet monkey. There is no way in knowing if that monkey is going to attack or not. If it did attack, the paralyzed man would have no way to protect himself. Even though it only could happen, it is always good to be on the safe side.

I strongly believe that if the A.D.A. did not make that law, we would be in a pretty tight situation. If I owned a store, I would not want monkeys and birds coming through my door. I think that the new rules are better for all of us. I personally would love to hear the other side of the story because right now, there is nothing that could change my mind.

To conclude, I would like to say that I strongly believe that A.D.A.'s new rules and regulations are better, more safe, and more helpful compared to the old rules.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 14

The vocabulary used is somewhat ineffective for audience and purpose. While the student uses the phrase "strongly believe" several times to strengthen the opinion, the reasons given for the opinion ("better, more safe, and more helpful") are not expressed in precise vocabulary, which weakens the opinion.

The strength of this paper is the student's style, which is evident throughout the response. The student says, "This is what really gives me the chills," and asks, "... how would that make passerby feel? Probably not so good." This technique helps to engage the reader and make the opinion essay entertaining to read. However, the lack of cited evidence and weak connections between elaboration and opinion result in a score of 2.

### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE F \* SCORE 2

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

I disagree with the rule because some people need more than a dog or a horse. What if they need help drinking and they need the monkey. Are you going to help him or her drink.

I know people need more than a dog or a horse because it says in source 2 it says "A capuchin monkey helps with many tasks." It also says in source 1 "... easy to train, and able to bond."

Next some people have disabilities and need help this is true because it says in source 3 "A man has a large snake draped over his shoulders ... 'service animal that helps and comforts him."

The final reason I disagree with the rule is some people need help from other animals I know this is true because it says in section 3 "... helpers, including pigs, birds, and lizards."

Now you know my opinion about that rule I think some should take this S.A. and change the rule but unfortunately I'm too young.

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response is a clear example of a 2, as it demonstrates simplistic language, uneven inclusion of source evidence, and cursory elaborative techniques.

There is use of cited evidence from the source material, as the response includes quotes from all three sources. However, the cited details chosen to support each point are weakly integrated. The student's first point is that "people need more than a dog or a horse." The student supports this idea with the cited details "A capuchin monkey helps with many tasks" and "... easy to train, and able to bond." The response does not adequately make the connection to why people need more than a dog or a horse; in fact, the second cited detail doesn't even mention what type of animal is easy to train and able to bond. Similarly, the student notes, "some people have disabilities and need help," and then supports that statement with "A man has a large snake draped over his shoulders ... 'service animal that helps and comforts him.'" No elaboration is given to explain why a snake would be an ideal animal to have as a service animal.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 18



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 17

- The vocabulary used is somewhat ineffective for audience and purpose. While the student states “I disagree” to begin their response and uses the phrase “final reason” to conclude, there are no other opinion vocabulary terms embedded in the writing.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE G \* SCORE 2

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



### STUDENT RESPONSE

Since there is a law that says **only service dogs and miniature horses were allowed in public places**, I think that's a **wonderful idea**.

One of the reasons is support my opinion is that **source 3 says some people have phobias/fears and they are afraid of pigs, snakes, monkeys, birds, lizards, ext.** It would not be very pleasand if you were trying to eat and **a monkey is stealing a banama off your plate**.

Another great reason is to protect the person from getting a deadly **diseases**. **Source 3 says that Certain diseases come from diffrent animals**. If a animal has a disease, they can pass the illness onto humans. **Do you really want your baby getting sick from a warthog?**

My last reason is **safty**. People at resteraunts should feel safe, not scared. They have the right to not get hurt by a wild animal, evan if its trained, it is still a wild animal. **The monkey could freak out if babies are crying. The bird could flip and fly out the window**. If I was in a resturant, I would want to be safe.

I think it is a **great idea** that **only dogs and miniature horses are allowed in public places**.

### RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

This response is an example of a 2, as evidence and elaboration from the sources are present but uneven and weakly integrated.

There is insufficient use of accurately cited source material. In paragraph 2, the student states that "source 3 says some people have phobias/fears and they are afraid of pigs, snakes, monkeys, birds, lizards, ext."; however, nowhere in source 3 or any other source is this stated or implied. In paragraph 3, the student notes that "Source 3 says that Certain diseases come from diffrent animals."; the actual source states, "different diseases come from certain animals."

The student elaborates on details from the sources, but this elaboration is not directly connected to the evidence. For example, the student states, "a monkey is stealing a banama off your plate," an elaboration that does not discuss phobia of animals. Furthermore, the student elaborates, "Do you really want your baby getting sick from a wart-hog?" While elaboration can and often does go beyond the sources, in this case the elaboration is not adequate because warthogs are not service animals and are never discussed in the sources as being

CONTINUED ON PAGE 21



## CONTINUED FROM PAGE 20

potential service animals. The uneven use of elaborative techniques provides only cursory support for the student's opinion.

The vocabulary used is generally appropriate for audience and purpose, as the student notes "phobias/fears," "diseases," and "safty" as reasons why this new law is appropriate. However, the student opens with, "wonderful idea" and closes with "great idea" to note support for the opinion that "only dogs and miniature horses are allowed in public places." A greater amount of precise language would have strengthened the opinion in this response.

There is a weak attempt to create style. The student says, "The monkey could freak out if babies are crying. The bird could flip and fly out the window." This technique helps to engage the reader but is not consistently used throughout the response.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea

# Grade 5 / Evidence and Elaboration

## SAMPLE H \* SCORE 1

### Opinion Performance Task

#### Focus Standards

Grade 5: W.5.1b; W.5.4; W.5.5; W.5.8; W.5.9; L.5.3



## STUDENT RESPONSE

### Opinion about Service animals

I have learned that disabled people need help from service animals and that I disagree with the new rule.

People that have been disabled and has a service animal should walk in a shop/restraunt and not be told, "Sorry only dogs and miniture horeses allowed", because if you have a service animal (besides a dog or miniture horse) to comfort you or help you you might have to ask somone to do it for you.

Animals like "Capuchin Monkeys are wonderful service animals, not everyone agrees. Capuchins are small, easy to train, and able to bond, However they are still wild. Other animals like dolphins and snakes can be a good way to calm people down while swimming/being in a big crowd.

I think that if there is a service animal that can make you calm or help you, you should not be told not to have it in public.

## RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

The preponderance of evidence in this response points to a score of 1, as there is limited use of source material and minimal elaboration.

The student communicates disagreement with this new rule and elaborates that "... if you have a service animal (besides a dog or a miniture horse) to comfort you or help you you might have to ask somone to do it for you." This statement is not precise, leaving out important information about the new law and how it would impact someone who had a different type of service animal; as such, it provides only vague support for the opinion. Paragraph 3 includes a partial quotation from a source (quotation marks are only present at the beginning of the quotation), and it is not accurately copied; in addition, no source is cited. Most importantly, the evidence included in paragraph 3 does not support the opinion ("However they are still wild."). The student fails to elaborate on this evidence and instead, in the next sentence, provides unclear ideas about other service animals from the sources.

The vocabulary used is uneven and somewhat ineffective for audience and purpose. The student uses words and phrases such as "disabled,"

CONTINUED ON PAGE 24



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 23

“disagree,” and “service animal”; however, there are several instances in which the student does not use precise vocabulary (e.g., “. . . you should not be told not to have it in public.”; “. . . should walk in a shop/restaurant and not be told . . .”).

There is an attempt to create style, but it is unevenly integrated. The response includes the student portraying how a shop owner would talk to a person with disabilities who attempted to bring a different type of service animal into a shop/restaurant by saying, “Sorry only dogs and miniature horses allowed.” Overall, the best score for this response is a 1.

## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

SCORE	4 POINTS	3 POINTS	2 POINTS	1 POINT	NS
EVIDENCE/ELABORATION	<p>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution of source material</li> <li>effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>effective, appropriate style enhances content</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</li> <li>adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</li> <li>generally appropriate style is evident</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</li> <li>weak use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</li> <li>vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</li> </ul>	<p>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the opinion and supporting idea(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</li> <li>insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</li> <li>minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</li> <li>vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</li> <li>little or no evidence of appropriate style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea