

# Student Samples: Grade 5

## 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

## 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"> <li>comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</li> <li>clear citations or attribution to 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 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"> <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 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"> <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 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"> <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

## Sample A

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. 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.

## Sample B

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 "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 businners 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. 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.

## Sample C

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 I support my opinion is that some people have phobias/fears and they are afraid of pigs, snakes, monkeys, birds, lizards, etc. It would not be very pleasant if you were trying to eat and a monkey is stealing a banana off your plate.

Another great reason is to protect the person from getting deadly diseases. Some say that certain diseases come from different animals. If an 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 safety. People at restaurants should feel safe, not scared. They have the right to not get hurt by a wild animal, even if it's 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 restaurant, I would want to be safe.

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

## Sample D

I disagree with the rules 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 rules 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.

## Sample E

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).

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.

## Sample F

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 maintain. 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.

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.

## Sample G

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 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.



## Sample H

### **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.