

Scoring Key: Grade 5

Informational Performance Task

Focus Standards

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

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

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

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

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E A	3	<p data-bbox="527 350 1946 415">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 444 1946 630">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 carry 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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 659 1946 964">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 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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 993 1946 1101">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."</p> <p data-bbox="527 1130 1946 1154">Holistically, this response is a low 3 as a result of its adequate use of evidence combined with uneven use of elaborative techniques.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E B	4	<p data-bbox="527 347 1955 415">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 441 1955 829">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 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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 855 1955 1122">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 1148 1955 1294">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."</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E C	2	<p data-bbox="527 347 1829 375">This response is an example of a 2, as evidence and elaboration from the sources are present but uneven and weakly integrated.</p> <p data-bbox="527 402 1948 548">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 different animals.”; the actual source states, “different diseases come from certain animals.”</p> <p data-bbox="527 576 1938 764">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 banana 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 warthog?” 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 potential service animals. The uneven use of elaborative techniques provides only cursory support for the student’s opinion.</p> <p data-bbox="527 792 1919 938">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 966 1919 1034">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.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E D	2	<p>This response is a clear example of a 2, as it demonstrates simplistic language, uneven inclusion of source evidence, and cursory elaborative techniques.</p> <p>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 dissabilities and need help," and then supports that statement with "A man has a larg 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.</p> <p>The vocabulary used is somewhat ineffective for audience and purpose. While the student states "I dissagre" to begin their response and uses the phrase "finiel reason" to conclude, there are no other opinion vocabulary terms embedded in the writing.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E E	2	<p data-bbox="527 350 1625 378">This paper provides uneven and cursory support for the opinion. There is insufficient use of source material.</p> <p data-bbox="527 404 1734 548">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 574 1759 805">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.”</p> <p data-bbox="527 831 1749 940">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 966 1759 1115">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.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E F	3	<p data-bbox="527 350 1948 418">This response provides adequate evidence and elaboration regarding the opinion that only dogs and miniature horses should be allowed as service animals.</p> <p data-bbox="527 443 1948 634">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 659 1948 927">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 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 <i>some</i> animals being unsafe, with no clarity about which animals.</p> <p data-bbox="527 951 1948 1143">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.”</p> <p data-bbox="527 1167 1598 1195">Holistically, this response demonstrates adequate use of evidence and elaboration/development of ideas.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E G	3	<p data-bbox="527 370 1892 440">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 467 1923 651">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 678 1944 862">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 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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 889 1934 1073">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.</p> <p data-bbox="527 1101 1713 1133">Holistically, this response demonstrates adequate use of evidence and elaborative techniques and earns a score of 3.</p>

SAMPLE NUMBER	SCORE	SCORE JUSTIFICATION
Sample Grade 5 E/E H	1	<p>The preponderance of evidence in this response points to a score of 1, as there is limited use of source material and minimal elaboration.</p> <p>The student communicates disagreement with this new rule and elaborates that “. . . if you have a service animal (besides a dog or a miniature horse) to comfort you or help you you might have to ask someone 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.</p> <p>The vocabulary used is uneven and somewhat ineffective for audience and purpose. The student uses words and phrases such as “disabled,” “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/restraunt and not be told . . .”).</p> <p>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 miniturehorses allowed.” Overall, the best score for this response is a 1.</p>