

Grade 6 / Constructed Response Student Samples

➔ NARRATIVE PERFORMANCE TASK

Item Prompt ITEM #2631	Explain what Source #1 and Source #3 say about how robots are able to save lives by paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism.
Claim, Target, and Standards	<p>Smarter Balanced Claim and Target: Claim 4, Research, Target 2. ANALYZE/INTEGRATE INFORMATION: Analyze information within and among sources of information (print and non-print texts, data sets, conducting procedures, etc.).</p> <p>Focus Standards for Target 2: RI-1, RI-6, RI-8, RI-9; RH- and RST-1, 2, 7–9; W-8, W-9; WHST-8, WHST-9</p> <p>DOK: 4</p>
Key Elements	<p>Source #1 (Meet the Robots)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gemini-Scout can test the air for gases, can find missing miners using a thermal camera, can be used to radio for help, and can even drag miners to safety.• The Dante 2 goes into a volcano if it is too dangerous for people. <p>Source #3 (When the Car Is the Driver)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A motorcycle cut off the driverless car. The car saw the move coming, while the people in the car hardly noticed.• Robots are never distracted. They don't text or drink or get tired. They see things no human can.• Google's robot driver uses radar to detect a car in front of an 18-wheeler—something that the human eye can't do.• The robot driver has more information than a human driver because of numerous sensors.



Response provides an adequate explanation of what Source #1 and Source #3 say about how robots are able to save lives and appropriately paraphrases both sources involved while avoiding plagiarism.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

Robots would be able to save lives in Source #1 and Source #3. because in Source #1. its talking about Gemini-Scout. Gemini-Scout goes to mines and saves people trapped underground, and it can also test the air in the mines for deadly gases, so it will tell people if the mine is safe. Source #3's Google car saves lives for bad drivers and drivers around them. For instance, people get distracted, but robots don't and they stay focused on driving safely.

RATIONALE

This response provides an adequate explanation of what Source #1 and Source #3 say about how robots save lives, including information about Gemini-Scout saving miners (from Source #1) and the safety of self-driving cars (from Source #3). The student paraphrases information from both sources without plagiarizing.



The response provides a limited/partial explanation of what Source #1 and Source #3 say about how robots are able to save lives and appropriately paraphrases both sources involved while avoiding plagiarism.

OR

The response provides an adequate explanation of what Source #1 and Source #3 say about how robots are able to save lives, but does not appropriately paraphrase all sources involved.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

Many robots are able to save lives. Some of them are small but they are still able to drag people out of a bad situation. Many of them are search and rescue. They can also carry emergency supplies like things that belong inside a first aid kit.

RATIONALE

While this response provides some details (“They can also carry emergency supplies like things that belong inside a first aid kit.”), it does not cite either source, and the details that it includes are from Source #1 only. This response appropriately paraphrases information from Source #1 while avoiding plagiarism, but it does not appropriately paraphrase all sources involved, so it earns a score of 1.



Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

The Dante 2. can climb in a volcano when its really bad. The Gemini-Scout tests gases to see if it’s bad.

RATIONALE

This response is insufficient. It provides only a limited explanation, based on Source #1. The facts included (“The Dante 2. can climb in a volcano when its really bad.” and “The Gemini-Scout tests gases to see if it’s bad.”) do little to identify or explain how the robots help save lives. The only paraphrase provided is “bad,” or “really bad,” which provides only a vague explanation in relation to the prompt.

Grade 6 / Constructed Response Student Samples

→ NARRATIVE PERFORMANCE TASK

Item Prompt ITEM #2632	Many robots are designed to do normal tasks that improve people’s lives or jobs. Provide two pieces of evidence from different sources that support this idea and explain how each example supports the idea. Cite evidence for each piece of information and identify the source title or number.
Claim, Target, and Standards	Smarter Balanced Claim and Target: Claim 4, Research, Target 4. USE EVIDENCE: Cite evidence to support analyses, arguments, or critiques. Focus Standards for Target 4 RI-9; RH-and RST-1 and 7–9; W-1b, W-8, W-9; WHST-8, WHST-9 DOK: 4
Key Elements	Source #1 (Meet the Robots) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Gower delivers medicine to different hospital rooms, reducing the workload for doctors, pharmacists, and nurses.• Agribots pick fruit when it is ripe. Source #2 (Robots that Play Well with Others) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Robots assemble electronics, guide trains, and sort trash.• People can get robot pets to teach tricks to, and these pets don’t need to be fed or walked Source #3 (When the Car Is the Driver) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-driving cars would make driving easier and safer.



Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from different sources that support this idea and that explains how each example supports the idea. Student cites the source for each example.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

In “When the Car Is the Driver,” the people explain how a self-driving car could improve your life, and it can. While the car is driving you to work or anywhere, really, you could be finishing up some important paperwork. If that paperwork is finished, then you won’t risk being fired. In “Robots That Play Well with Others,” people explain that the robot Robbie from the story “I, Robot” can offer endless fun. If Robbie was a real robot, parents could be able to get more things done while Robbie plays with their children. The childrens’ lives could also be improved because instead of sitting around doing nothing, they would be playing and exersizing.

RATIONALE

The response provides two pieces of evidence from different sources that show how robots can improve our everyday lives. The first is from Source #3 and the second is from Source #2. The student explains how each piece of evidence supports the idea that robots can do normal tasks that improve people’s lives. The student cites both sources by title.



Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from different sources that support this idea but doesn't explain how each example supports the idea. Student cites the sources.

Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from a single source that supports this idea and that explains how that example supports the idea. Student cites the source.

or

Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides only one piece of evidence from a single source that support this idea and that explains how that example supports the idea. Student cites the source.

Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from different sources that support this idea and that explains how each example supports the idea. Student does not cite sources.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

In source #1 the agribots improve peoples job because they dont need need to hand-pick fruits and vegetables.

In source #3. self driving cars improve peoples lives because they dont need to worry about driving. The car does it for them.

RATIONALE

In this response, the student includes evidence from two different sources that support the idea that robots can improve our lives or jobs. The student also cites the sources by number. The student does not, however, adequately explain how each piece of evidence supports the idea, and the response therefore earns a score of 1.



Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

SAMPLE RESPONSE

1. Agrobots
These robots pick produce.
2. self driveing car

RATIONALE

This response is insufficient. While it hints at evidence from two different sources, the sources are not cited, and the response includes no explanation.