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## Types of Assessments: Graphic Organizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does formative assessment look like in my context?</td>
<td>What questions about teaching and learning am I trying to answer with formative assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What instructional decisions can I make using this data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Assessment</td>
<td>Summative Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does interim assessment look like in my context?</td>
<td>What does summative assessment look like in my context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What questions about teaching and learning am I trying to answer with interim assessment?</td>
<td>What instructional decisions can I make using this data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What instructional decisions can I make using this data?</td>
<td>What questions about teaching and learning am I trying to answer with summative assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What instructional decisions can I make using this data?</td>
<td>What instructional decisions can I make using this data?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 8.5. Types and Uses of Assessments Within Assessment Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Uses/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Minute-by-Minute | • Observation  
• Questions (teachers and students)  
• Instructional tasks  
• Student discussions  
• Written work/representations | • Students’ current learning status, relative difficulties and misunderstandings, emerging or partially formed ideas, full understanding | • Keep going, stop and find out more, provide oral feedback to individuals, adjust instructional moves in relation to student learning status (e.g., act on “teachable moments”) |
| Daily Lesson | Planned and placed strategically in the lesson:  
• Observation  
• Questions (teachers and students)  
• Instructional tasks  
• Student discussions  
• Written work/representations  
• Student self-reflection (e.g., quick write) | • Students’ current learning status, relative difficulties and misunderstandings, emerging or partially formed ideas, full understanding | • Continue with planned instruction  
• Instructional adjustments in this or the next lesson  
• Find out more  
• Feedback to class or individual students (oral or written) |
| Week       | • Student discussions and work products  
• Student self-reflection (e.g., journaling) | • Students’ current learning status relative to lesson learning goals (e.g., have students met the goal[s], are they nearly there?) | • Instructional planning for start of new week  
• Feedback to students (oral or written) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Uses/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-Unit/Project</td>
<td>• Student work artifacts (e.g., portfolio, writing project, oral presentation)</td>
<td>• Status of student learning relative to unit learning goals</td>
<td>• Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of rubrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student self-reflection (e.g., short survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher reflection on effectiveness of planning and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other classroom summative assessments designed by teacher(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher grade level/departmental discussions of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly/Interim/Benchmark</td>
<td>• Portfolio</td>
<td>• Status of achievement of intermediate goals toward meeting standards (results aggregated and disaggregated)</td>
<td>• Making within-year instructional decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oral reading observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring, reporting; grading; same-year adjustments to curriculum programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher reflection on effectiveness of planning and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Readjusting professional learning priorities and resource decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>• Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment</td>
<td>• Status of student achievement with respect to standards (results aggregated and disaggregated)</td>
<td>• Judging students’ overall learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CELDT</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gauging student, school, district, and state year-to-year progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring, reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District/school created test</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Classification and placement (e.g., ELs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjustments to following year’s instruction, curriculum, programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Final grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional learning prioritization and resource decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher reflection (individual/grade level/department) on overall effectiveness of planning and instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview of Major Assessment Types in Standards-Based Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
<th>Diagnostic Assessment</th>
<th>Interim/Benchmark Assessment</th>
<th>Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process teachers and students use to continuously gather evidence of student learning</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Evidence is used to adapt instruction on moment-to-moment and day-to-day bases&lt;br&gt;• Requires evidence gathering that provides diagnostic information</td>
<td>• Formal strategies and/or tools used to identify specific strengths and weaknesses in student learning relative to specific learning standards and/or goals&lt;br&gt;• Focused on individual students</td>
<td>• Assessment administered at specified intervals over the course of the academic year&lt;br&gt;• Compares student learning or performance against set of learning standards or objectives&lt;br&gt;• May be common across classes or schools</td>
<td>• Measures students’ knowledge and skills relative to specific learning standards or goals&lt;br&gt;• Also referred to as a “culminating assessment”&lt;br&gt;• May be “high-stakes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview of Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
<th>Diagnostic Assessment</th>
<th>Interim/Benchmark Assessment</th>
<th>Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purposes</strong></td>
<td>• Informs teaching and learning</td>
<td>• Identifies potential learning strengths and difficulties and/or areas that require further development</td>
<td>• Predicts student’s end-of-year proficiency</td>
<td>• Provides overall description of students’ learning status, enabling monitoring and evaluation of student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitors student learning and progress, based on lesson goals</td>
<td>• Provides teachers with information to inform next possible instructional steps</td>
<td>• Monitors students’ progress toward longer-term goals</td>
<td>• Evaluates effectiveness of the educational environment at various levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides immediate or very timely feedback on student understanding</td>
<td>• Identifies and provides support for struggling students, teachers, schools</td>
<td>• Identifies and provides information to inform school improvement</td>
<td>• Provides information for accountability purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Signals important learning goals</td>
<td>• Evaluates learning outcomes</td>
<td>• Evaluates school improvement planning</td>
<td>• Provides school improvement planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Signals important learning goals</td>
<td>• Signals important learning goals</td>
<td>• Signals important learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format Examples</strong></td>
<td>• Teacher-created tests and quizzes</td>
<td>• Observation protocol</td>
<td>• Condensed summative assessment</td>
<td>• Large-scale assessment (e.g., annual statewide assessments, Smarter Balanced or PARCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of student work</td>
<td>• Written or oral assessment</td>
<td>• May include item banks</td>
<td>• School, classroom assessment (e.g., end-of-unit test or end-of-course exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions during classroom discussion</td>
<td>• May draw on item banks</td>
<td>• Common performance tasks</td>
<td>• May include item banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations</td>
<td>• Educator or commercially developed</td>
<td>• Educator or commercially developed assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview of Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
<th>Diagnostic Assessment</th>
<th>Interim/Benchmark Assessment</th>
<th>Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing: formative assessment process is embedded within teaching and learning, or done as it fits within an instructional plan or schedule</td>
<td>May be routine if given as part of a cycle of instruction</td>
<td>May be given at regular intervals (e.g., end of a quarter or trimester, or at the midpoint of an extended curricular unit)</td>
<td>Generally administered at a single point in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May be given multiple times across year</td>
<td>Results are generally provided in a timely manner to contribute to learning process</td>
<td>Large-scale summative assessment may be given on an annual basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be given as pre- and/or post-instruction assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom summative assessment may be given at the end of a course, or calendar period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Uses</strong></td>
<td>Formative assessment appears as informal and formal checkpoints on students’ learning during the course of instruction</td>
<td>Diagnostic assessment may be given in the classroom to obtain insight into students’ learning challenges</td>
<td>Interim/benchmark assessment can be used to monitor student learning and may be predictive of students’ end-of-year performance</td>
<td>Summative assessment may be given to evaluate and monitor student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides feedback to students and teachers in short-term intervals</td>
<td>Feedback can inform how teachers provide learning support, as well as next possible steps in instruction</td>
<td>Classroom interim/benchmark assessment can also inform improvement strategies for teachers, schools and districts</td>
<td>May inform teaching and learning at the program, school, and district levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly embedded in and informs ongoing teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom summative assessments also inform improvement strategies for programs, classroom, schools and districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium:
Performance Task Specifications

Role of Smarter Balanced Performance Tasks

Taken during the final 12 weeks of the school year, the Smarter Balanced summative assessments for accountability will have two components: a comprehensive end-of-year computer adaptive assessment and performance tasks. These assessments in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics will provide measures of students’ achievement (proficiency in meeting grade-level standards), academic growth, and progress toward college and career readiness. The focus of both assessment components will be the claims and targets identified in the Smarter Balanced content specifications for ELA/literacy and mathematics, which serve as “bridge documents” between the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced summative assessments. Through the use of technology and innovative item and task formats, the Smarter Balanced assessments will exemplify “next generation assessments,” significantly improving upon traditional, large-scale accountability tests in terms of authenticity, accessibility, and coverage of skills that are identified in college and career standards (e.g., mathematics practices, problem solving, speaking and listening, use of technology), as described in the Smarter Balanced content specifications.

The domain of performance assessment is quite broad, encompassing a range of non–selected-response tasks. A Smarter Balanced performance task involves significant interaction of students with stimulus materials and/or engagement in a problem solution, ultimately leading to an exhibition of the students’ application of knowledge and skills, often in writing or spoken language. Stimuli include a variety of information forms (e.g., readings, video clips, data), as well as an assignment or problem situation. A key component of college and career readiness is the ability to integrate knowledge and skills across multiple content standards. Smarter Balanced will address this ability through performance tasks, because it cannot be adequately assessed with selected-response or constructed-response items.
Student Directions

Service Animals Opinion Performance Task

Task:
A person with a disability visited your class today to discuss how his trained service animal allows him to enjoy more independence and participate more fully in everyday activities. You and your classmates became interested in learning more about service animals. Your teacher took your class to the school library to look up more information about this topic. You have found three articles about service animals.

After you have looked at these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly scan the sources and the three questions that follow. Then, go back and read the sources carefully so you will have the information you will need to answer the questions and complete your research. You may click on the Global Notes button to take notes on the information you find in the sources as you read. You may also use scratch paper to take notes.

In Part 2, you will write an opinion paper on a topic related to the sources.

Directions for Beginning:
You will now examine several sources. You can re-examine any of the sources as often as you like.

Research Questions:
After looking at the sources, use the rest of the time in Part 1 to answer three questions about them. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, your answers will help you think about the information you
have read and looked at, which should help you write your opinion paper.

You may click on the Global Notes button or refer back to your scratch paper to look at your notes when you think it would be helpful. Answer the questions in the spaces below the items.

Both the Global Notes on the computer and your written notes on scratch paper will be available to you in Part 1 and Part 2 of the performance task.

Part 1

Sources for Performance Task:

Source #1
You have found a current article about capuchin monkeys on a website about service animals. The author is a veterinarian who writes articles for educational publications.

Monkey Helpers
by Tamra Orr

An Unusual Set of Helping Hands
Every day people make countless moves that they tend to take for granted. They scratch their noses and pull on their backpacks. People grab something to eat and push up their glasses. They flip the pages of their textbooks and turn off their lights. For people living with injuries to the spinal cord, however, these basic movements are very difficult. For some, they are even impossible. For the past 35 years, more than 160 people with injuries to the spinal cord have found support from a very unusual set of helping hands: those of specially trained capuchin monkeys.
Capuchin monkeys are very small. Some weigh less than eight pounds, even when fully grown. They are also extremely smart. In the wild, they have shown the ability to pick up tools and use them to solve problems. Their hands can easily carry small tools. This makes it easier for them to handle modern items such as remotes and cell phones.

Although capuchin monkeys are smart and are able to handle small tools, not all types of monkeys are ideal to use as service animals. Some monkeys, such as howler monkeys, are too large or strong. Monkeys who have not been properly trained are also unreliable. They might behave in ways that are hard to predict. For example, a monkey could suddenly hurt a person if it got angry or frightened for some reason.

While some people believe capuchin monkeys are wonderful service animals, not everyone agrees. Capuchins are small, easy to train, and able to bond, or form close relationships, with humans. However, they are still, in the end, wild animals. April Truitt, director of the Primate Rescue Center in Kentucky, says that having a wild animal in your home may put both the animal and the owner at increased risk of getting injured. She points out that it is possible for capuchins to become violent suddenly and this can be a danger to their owners and others.

Long Before School Starts
Long before capuchin monkeys begin their training, they have already spent years around humans. Born in a Massachusetts zoo, they must live with foster families as long as twelve years before beginning their training on how to assist a person with a disability. During this time, they are taught how to share a house
with humans. They get used to being around pets. They even learn basic tasks like how to take baths. This requires a great deal of time and effort.

**Learning to Help**
Capuchin monkeys learn how to assist people with disabilities at Helping Hands, otherwise known as the monkey college, in Boston, Massachusetts. This college is not quite like going to a traditional school. Every day, for three to five years, capuchin monkeys learn new skills. Their lessons do not focus on reading and writing though. Days are spent learning how to load a DVD into a player and push play, or how to open and close microwave doors. This education takes time, patience, and money. The cost of educating just one monkey is close to $40,000. Finally, after up to five years of training, the animals finish school. Now the monkeys are ready to go and live with someone who needs them to help make life a little bit easier.

**The Simple Things**
Having a capuchin monkey in the house is not the same as having a dog or cat. Because of their training and their intelligence, these monkeys are able to do an amazing number of chores for the person who is disabled and cannot do them alone. Along with operating microwaves and DVD players, these service animals can also turn lights off and on for their new owners. They can open bottles and flip the pages of a book for their owner. They can even reach out and scratch an annoying itch.

Every year, Helping Hands places dozens of monkeys in homes of people with disabilities. The monkeys take good care of their owners. In return, the owners feel safer and more able to do tasks that so many others take for granted.
Sources Used


Source #2
You found an article about service animals in a 2002 issue of Click, a magazine for children.

Animals Helping People

A monkey who helps you drink out of a straw? A dog that opens the refrigerator door when you want a snack? A pony gentle enough to ride even if you cannot see? When people need extra care, special animals are there to help!

Seeing Eye dogs are trained to be the eyes for people who cannot see. All over the world, Seeing Eye dogs are hard at work—guiding, protecting, and loving their blind masters.
Horseback riding is good exercise. It also helps people feel happy and confident. Even riders who cannot see, or who have trouble moving their muscles, can have fun on a quiet, gentle, well-trained horse.

Hearing dogs help people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. These smart, friendly, energetic dogs are specially trained to let their owners know when the doorbell rings, the smoke alarm goes off, or the baby wakes up from a nap.

This boy needs both his hands and all his energy just to walk. Luckily, his assistance dog is there to carry his backpack. Assistance dogs are good helpers—and good friends!

![An assistance dog is trained to help](image)

... Assistance animals like this capuchin monkey are smart and nimble enough to help in lots of ways—they can turn the lights on and off, play a CD, or get their owners a cool drink!
A capuchin monkey helps with many tasks

This girl is part of a special program to help children with serious physical and learning difficulties. Swimming with dolphins helps the children relax—and who wouldn't love being around such wild and beautiful creatures!

Dolphins are calming creatures


Source #3
This article from a magazine about animal rights describes new service animal rules that are included as part of a federal law. The author is on staff at the magazine and has a legal background.
New Service Animal Rules
by Clare Mishica

New rules regarding service animals were added to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in March 2011. The ADA is a law that protects the rights of people with disabilities.

The new rules limit the kind of service animals that people with disabilities can have in public places. Now, only dogs and miniature horses are allowed in public places. The changes were meant to clear up confusion regarding service animals in public places. Business owners were unclear about the kind of service animals that were allowed in their businesses. They were also unclear about the amount of responsibility that they had for service animals that were brought into their businesses.

A man has a large snake draped over his shoulders. He wants to enter a café for lunch and says the snake is a service animal that helps and comforts him. In the past, the law would have required the café to allow the man to bring his snake inside. This was because people were allowed to choose any service animal as helpers, including pigs, birds, and lizards! Before the new rule, any type of animal could have been considered a service animal. As long as the owner felt that the animal provided him/her assistance, then any type of animal could be used as a service animal. Once the new rules went into effect, the only service animals permitted in public places are dogs and miniature horses.

What Made the Changes Necessary?
The changes were needed to protect people from
diseases. Different animals carry certain diseases. When animals go into public places, they might pass illnesses to humans. In addition, some animals are not trained to keep an area clean. For example, birds could leave droppings on a store floor. This creates an unhealthy setting for others.

Second, the law was changed to help business owners. In the past, businesses such as hotels had to accept all types of service animals, and that could create problems. For example, some animals are large or noisy. Others might cause damage or have special needs. 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.

Some people prefer to use service animals other than dogs and miniature horses and this is still possible. The new rules limit only the kind of service animals permitted in public places. In private, people are able to choose other animals. Some people with disabilities use monkeys to help them do tasks in their homes. These monkeys have similar hand and finger control to humans, so they can perform more tasks than other animals.

Would you like to learn more about the federal rules for service animals? You can visit the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) website. It gives details and reasons for changes in the rules.

Sources Used

Manning, S. (2011, April 11). Changing definitions new federal law limits service animals to dogs and

Click on the boxes to match each source with the idea or ideas that it supports. Some ideas may have more than one source selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source #1: Monkey Helpers</th>
<th>Source #2: Animals Helping People</th>
<th>Source #3: New Service Animal Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who own businesses have to consider the well-being of all of their guests.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being smart and able to handle small objects makes certain animals more appropriate than other animals to assist people who have a disability.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sources discuss how service animals help people. Explain what you have learned about how service animals help people. Use **one** detail from Source #1 and **one** detail from Source #2 to support your explanation. For each detail, include the source title or number.

Which source would **most likely** be the most helpful in understanding how a service animal is trained? Explain why this source is **most likely** the most helpful. Give at least **two** details from the source to support your answer.
Student Directions

Service Animals Opinion Performance Task

Part 2
You will now review your notes and sources, and plan, draft, revise, and edit your writing. You may use your notes and go back to the sources. Now read your assignment and the information about how your writing will be scored; then begin your work.

Your Assignment:
When your class returns from the library, your classmates begin to share what they learned about different types of service animals. They also begin to discuss the new rule that allows only dogs and miniature horses as service animals in public places. Some students agree with the rule, and some students disagree with the rule. Your teacher asks you to write a paper explaining your opinion about the new rule.

In your paper, you will take a side as to whether you agree with the rule allowing only service dogs and miniature horses in public places, or whether you disagree with the rule. Your paper will be read by your teacher and your classmates. Make sure you clearly state your opinion and write several paragraphs supporting your opinion with reasons and details from the sources. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to give the source title or number for the details or facts you use.

REMEMBER: A well-written opinion paper

- has a clear opinion.
- is well-organized and stays on the topic.
- has an introduction and conclusion.
- uses transitions.
- uses details or facts from the sources to support your opinion.
- puts the information from the sources in your own words, except when using direct quotations from the sources.
- gives the title or number of the source for the details or facts you included.
- develops ideas clearly.
- uses clear language.
- follows rules of writing (spelling, punctuation, and grammar).
**Now begin work on your opinion paper.** Manage your time carefully so that you can

1. plan your opinion paper.
2. write your opinion paper.
3. revise and edit the final draft of your opinion paper.

Word-processing tools and spell check are available to you.

For Part 2, you are being asked to write an opinion paper that is several paragraphs long. Type your response in the box below. The box will get bigger as you type.

Remember to check your notes and your prewriting/planning as you write and then revise and edit your opinion paper.

**For BEAL Session 2.A: Outline Only**
Smarter Balanced
Assessment Consortium:

English/Language Arts Practice Test Scoring Guide
Grade 8 Performance Task

5/16/2014

Adapted for BEAL Session 2.A:
Experience a Task
Student Directions

Penny Argumentative Performance Task

Task:
In recent years, a heated debate has emerged about money in the United States. This particular debate is not about big economic issues, though. Surprisingly, it is about the economic pros and cons of producing and using pennies.

The controversies surrounding the production and continued use of pennies is one of the topics that will be part of an upcoming website project for your history class. As part of your initial research, you have uncovered four sources about the historical and economic impact of the penny.

After you have reviewed these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly scan the sources and the three questions that follow. Then, go back and read the sources carefully so you will have the information you will need to answer the questions and finalize your research. You may click on the Global Notes button to take notes on the information you find in the sources as you read. You may also use scratch paper to take notes.

In Part 2, you will write an argumentative essay on a topic related to the sources.

Directions for Beginning:
You will now examine several sources. You can re-examine any of the sources as often as you like.
Research Questions:
After examining the research sources, use the remaining time in Part 1 to answer three questions about them. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, your answers will help you think about the research sources you have read and looked at, which should help you write your argumentative essay.

You may click on the Global Notes button or refer back to your scratch paper to look at your notes when you think it would be helpful. Answer the questions in the spaces below the items.

Both the Global Notes on the computer and your written notes on scratch paper will be available to you in Part 1 and Part 2 of the performance task.

Part 1

Sources for Performance Task:

Source #1
The following article is from the New York Times, published on April 7, 2012.

Penny Wise, or 2.4 Cents Foolish?
by Jeff Sommer

The news from north of the border is both trivial and unsettling: they won't be making shiny new pennies in Canada anymore.

The government in Ottawa has made this decision after years of deliberation\(^1\), for reasons that would seem to apply equally well in the United States.
"Pennies take up too much space on our dressers at home," Jim Flaherty, the Canadian finance minister, said in a speech last month. A persuasive government brochure put it this way: "We often store them in jars, throw them away in water fountains, or refuse them as change."

Pennies cost more to produce than they are worth. [T]hey are worth so little that many Canadians don't bother to use them at all. . . .

Do we really need pennies?

The Canadian government doesn't think so. By the fall, it plans to stop minting them and stop distributing them through banks. It won't actually ban them, though. Some people have grown so attached to pennies—a penny saved is a penny earned, after all—that they may want to keep using them indefinitely, and they can, the Canadian government says.

But those who can bear to part with their pennies are being encouraged to bring them to banks for eventual melting or to donate them to charities—which will presumably bring them in for melting. Electronic transactions will continue to include cents, while retail sales will be rounded up or down.

Inflation is sometimes cited as a threat whenever small coins are phased out. A $2.01 cup of coffee should be rounded down to $2, while $2.03 should become $2.05, for example, but retailers in the real world might raise prices more than lower them. That could cause a small, one-time inflation burst, says
François Velde, an expert on the history of small change.

"But in a competitive market, you might well see price decreases," says Mr. Velde, a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago who is working this year at the Bank of France. "In a place like New York, a 99-cent price of pizza might go down to 95 cents rather than $1 to avoid crossing that higher price threshold." Over all and over time, there should be no net price effect, he says.

He finds the argument for phasing out the penny to be at least as strong in the United States as in Canada because the two nations' small coins, political history and socioeconomic culture have so much in common. "That's what makes the Canadian decision a little unsettling," he says. "Their pennies even look a lot like ours."

In the United States, the mint says, each zinc and copper coin costs 2.41 cents to produce and distribute. It costs 1.6 Canadian cents to make a penny at the mint in Winnipeg, according to Canadian government figures. (A Canadian cent is worth about 0.99 cents at the current exchange rate.) "From the standpoint of economics, that's just a total waste of money," Mr. Velde says.

Pennies may not be big money, even if you add them together. But we are paying a cost for the privilege of squirreling them away in drawers and on dressers. The United States government—that is, taxpayers—lost $60.2 million on the production and distribution of pennies in the 2011 fiscal year, the mint's budget shows, and the losses have been mounting: $27.4
million in 2010, and $19.8 million in 2009.

A number of countries, including Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Britain, have already dropped their lowest-denominated coins, without dire consequences.

What is to be done in the United States? The mint defers to Congress, and Congress hasn't told it to abolish the penny. Lawmakers have directed the mint to study ways to make small coins more cheaply. Mike White, a spokesman for the mint, says a report will be completed in December.

At the very least, a change in the composition of the American penny seems likely.

In 1982, Congress authorized the Treasury to make such a change, and it did. Before then, pennies were 95 percent copper and 5 percent zinc. Pennies manufactured since have been copper-plated zinc, with zinc making up 97.5 percent of the coin and copper only 2.5 percent. Steel, which was used in pennies in World War II, could be substituted next.

But why stop at the penny? It's not the only American coin that costs more than it's worth. Each nickel costs 11.18 cents to produce and distribute, the mint says, at a loss to taxpayers of $56.5 million in the last fiscal year. In its 2013 budget proposal, the Obama administration has asked for authority to alter the composition of the nickel, too.

"The whole situation is ridiculous," Mr. Velde says. ". . . The serious, simple solution is to do away with
A penny for your thoughts?

1deliberation: discussion or debate
2Canadian finance minister: responsible for presenting the Canadian government's budget each year and helping to determine the funding levels for government departments
3Inflation: causing prices to increase


Source #2
The following is a newspaper article published in December 2012.

Is the Penny Worth It?
by Rachel Mancuso

The United States Department of Defense doesn't think so. For over 30 years, pennies haven't been used on foreign military bases. Pennies are "too heavy and are not cost-effective" to ship," according to Chris Ward, a spokesman for the Army and Air Force Exchange Service. This idea is the topic of much discussion lately, and the US Congress is considering eliminating the penny from the United States currency system.
On foreign military bases, instead of using pennies, the shops and restaurants round to the nearest 5-cents. For example, if a lunch bill comes out to $9.06, it would be rounded down to $9.05. If it was $9.09, it would be rounded up to $9.10.

The rounding system seems to work well for the military, and some experts such as Harvard professor N. Gregory Mankiw want to do the same in the entire United States. Some people fear that rounding will end up costing people extra money. Mark Weller, Americans for Common Cents spokesperson, claims that stores will not choose to round their prices down. He claims that what he calls the "rounding tax" will cost consumers $600 million per year. Dr. Robert Whaples, a professor at Wake Forest, disagrees and does not think the economic impact of eliminating pennies will be significant.

Not only does he believe that it will have an insignificant impact on prices, but Whaples seems to think that eliminating the penny will save time too. He asserts that this time saved is even more valuable than eliminating a potential impact on rounding prices. His study says that the time wasted counting pennies could add up to over $700 million per year nationwide. To a retail business, time is money because many retail businesses pay their employees by the hour. If the retail clerk and customer spend just 2.5 seconds per transaction counting pennies, those seconds add up. Those seconds add up to an estimated $700 million in wages that businesses pay retail clerks to count pennies.

Not everyone agrees that the penny should be totally eliminated. Many argue that price-rounding cannot be
done fairly, and that finding a way to make pennies cheaper is a better approach. Steel, which was used to make pennies during World War II, would be a cheaper alternative. No matter what your stance, the penny debate is real, and the United States has to make a decision one way or the other.

¹cost-effective: producing desirable results without costing a lot of money
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Source #3
The following newspaper article examines the efforts of one school to use pennies to help a worthy cause.

Give a Penny—Save the Day!
by Ted Waterhouse

Last week, Washington Middle School (WMS) hosted its annual Penny Drive for Charity. Students from every grade brought in bags and jars of pennies, and, with everyone's assistance, they raised over $3000 in one week!

This amazing effort was made possible due to the power of the penny. Many people do not see the value in the penny, and they feel as though pennies are not worth the trouble of carrying them around.

Pennies might be a little bulky, but they add up; moreover, because they are worth so little, people don't mind donating them to charity. Students at WMS found that out for themselves last week.

If the school had organized a dime or a quarter drive, they probably would not have raised as much money. As Michael Cooper, an eighth grader, said, "If you asked for my quarters, I would have said 'no' because I use them for video games. Pennies don't really matter much, so I was happy to give them to someone who could use them." Many other students I spoke with echoed Michael's words.

Bottom line: A penny is not worth much by itself, but as WMS found out, there is power in numbers. When people put all their pennies together for a good cause, they can add up quickly, and they can truly help a
good cause. So if you don't see much value in a penny, WMS can put it to good use!
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**Source #4**
The following article from a general interest magazine published in 2014 explores some of the changes the penny has gone through.

**The Ever-Changing Penny**
by Maria Story

The one-cent piece, commonly referred to as the "penny," has been a part of United States history for over two hundred years. Its design has changed twenty-one times. History also shows that as the economy has changed, so has the value of the coin.

The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large—larger than our modern day quarter and had different images of the Statue of Liberty on the front. People did not really like how big they were. Several other versions of the coin were minted before finally producing the familiar Lincoln penny in 1909. Since then, ten varieties have been minted, mostly because of changes in metal content. Changing metal content was important to try to reduce production costs. The
U.S. Mint is still exploring additional designs and different, more cost effective, metal compositions for the penny.

The history of a penny reveals more than just a coin—it exposes a piece of American culture. The one-cent piece has influenced our language, giving us a number of idioms\(^2\), such as "a penny for your thoughts" (a way to ask what someone is thinking) and "not one red cent" (meaning no money at all). The coin also gave rise to the terms like "penny candy" (a piece of candy sold for a cent) and "penny arcade" (an amusement center with machines that cost one cent to operate).

Despite its cultural influences the penny is currently under attack. The reason? Because making money also costs money. In 2011, it cost the U.S. Mint more than 2.4 cents to produce one penny. This has led many to argue that the penny is inflating the economy and should be eliminated. However, what many people fail to also consider is that the nickel, too, costs more to produce than it is worth. In 2011, the cost for the U.S. Mint to produce a nickel was over eleven cents. Even though production costs are slightly lower today, the penny still costs the U.S. just over 1.8 cents to produce. The nickel's cost is currently 9.4 cents.

The history of the American penny is a curious one. How long it will remain a part of our spending currency is yet to be determined.

\(^1\)production costs: costs of the materials and labor needed to manufacture something
2. idiom: a word or phrase that means something different from its usual meaning
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Source #4 describes how some people want to eliminate the penny from the United States' economy. Explain how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader's understanding of the potential effects of eliminating pennies in the United States. Give two details from Source #2 to support your explanation.

All of the sources provide information about the penny. Which source would most likely be relevant to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny? Justify your answer and support it with two pieces of information from the sources.
Look at the claims in the table. Decide if the information in Source #3, Source #4, both sources, or neither source supports each claim. Click on the box that identifies the source that supports each claim. There will be only one box selected for each claim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source #3: Give a Penny—Save the Day!</th>
<th>Source #4: The Ever-Changing Penny</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The penny has more value than what it can buy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounding price totals will cause an increase in prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low value of a penny is a good thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the metals in the penny is a possible solution for people who want to keep the penny.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Directions

Penny Argumentative Performance Task

Part 2

You will now review your notes and sources, and plan, draft, revise, and edit your writing. You may use your notes and refer to the sources. Now read your assignment and the information about how your writing will be scored; then begin your work.

Your Assignment:
As a contribution to the website your history class is creating, you decide to write an argumentative essay that addresses the issues surrounding the penny. Your essay will be displayed on the website and will be read by students, teachers, and parents who visit the website.

Your assignment is to use the research sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay either for or against the continued production of the penny in the United States. Make sure you establish an argumentative claim, address potential counterarguments, and support your claim from the sources you have read. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to reference the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.

Argumentative Essay Scoring:
Your argumentative essay will be scored using the following:

1. Organization/purpose: How well did you state your claim, address opposing claims, and maintain your claim with a logical progression of ideas from beginning to end? How well did your ideas thoughtfully flow from beginning to end using effective transitions? How effective was your introduction and your conclusion?

2. Evidence/elaboration: How well did you integrate relevant and specific information from the sources? How well did you elaborate your ideas? How well did you clearly state ideas in your own words using precise language that is appropriate for your audience and purpose? How well did you reference the sources you used by title or number?

3. Conventions: How well did you follow the rules of grammar usage, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling?
Now begin work on your argumentative essay. Manage your time carefully so that you can

- plan your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.
- write your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.
- revise and edit the final draft of your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.

Word-processing tools and spell check are available to you.

For Part 2, you are being asked to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay, so please be as thorough as possible. Type your response in the space provided. The box will expand as you type.

Remember to check your notes and your prewriting/planning as you write and then revise and edit your argumentative essay.

For BEAL Session 2.A: Outline Only
### Grade 3-5 Summative Assessment Targets, Claim #2

**ELA/Literacy Claim # 2**

Students can produce effective writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>for example</strong> to connect opinion and reasons.</td>
<td>state an opinion, and create an organizational structure in which related ideas are grouped to support the writer’s purpose.</td>
<td>organizational structure in which ideas are logically grouped to support the writer’s purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section.</td>
<td>b. Provide reasons that are supported by facts and details.</td>
<td>b. Provide logically ordered reasons that are supported by facts and details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall information from experiences or gather information from print and digital sources; take brief notes on sources and sort evidence into provided categories.</td>
<td>c. Link opinion and reasons using words and phrases (e.g., <em>for instance, in order to, in addition</em>).</td>
<td>c. Link opinion and reasons using words, phrases, and clauses (e.g., <em>consequently, specifically</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.</td>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.</td>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; take notes and categorize information, and provide a list of sources.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; summarize or paraphrase information in notes and finished work, and provide a list of sources.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; summarize or paraphrase information in notes and finished work, and provide a list of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td><strong>L-3a</strong> Expand, combine, and reduce sentences for meaning, reader/listener interest, and style.</td>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target 7. COMPOSE FULL TEXTS:** Write full opinion pieces about topics using a complete writing process attending to purpose and audience: organize ideas by stating a context and focus (opinion), include structures and appropriate transitional strategies for coherence, elaborate and include supporting reasons from sources and an appropriate conclusion.

**Target 7. COMPOSE FULL TEXTS:** Write full opinion pieces about topics using a complete writing process attending to purpose and audience: organize ideas by stating a context and focus (opinion); include structures and appropriate transitional strategies for coherence; elaborate and include supporting evidence/reasons from sources; and develop an appropriate conclusion related to the opinion presented.
## Grade 3-5 Summative Assessment Targets, Claim #2

### ELA/Literacy Claim # 2

Students can produce effective writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gr. 3 Standards:</strong> W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1-d, W-4, W-5, W-8 (DOK 4)</td>
<td><strong>Gr. 4 Standards:</strong> W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1-d, W-4, W-5, W-8, W-9 (DOK 4)</td>
<td><strong>Gr. 5 Standards:</strong> W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1-d, W-4, W-5, W-8, W-9 (DOK 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>W-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>W-1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Introduce a topic or text they are writing about, state an opinion, and create an organizational structure that lists reasons.</td>
<td>a. Introduce a topic or text clearly, state an opinion, and create an organizational structure in which related ideas are grouped to support the writer’s purpose.</td>
<td>a. Introduce a topic or text clearly, state an opinion, and create an organizational structure in which ideas are logically grouped to support the writer’s purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provide reasons that support the opinion.</td>
<td>b. Provide reasons that are supported by facts and details.</td>
<td>b. Provide logically ordered reasons that are supported by facts and details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Use linking words and phrases (e.g., because, therefore, since, for example) to connect opinion and reasons.</td>
<td>c. Link opinion and reasons using words and phrases (e.g., for instance, in order to, in addition).</td>
<td>c. Link opinion and reasons using words and clauses (e.g., consequently, specifically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section.</td>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.</td>
<td>d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-4</strong> With guidance and support from adults, produce writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</td>
<td><strong>W-4</strong> Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</td>
<td><strong>W-4</strong> Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-5</strong> With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.</td>
<td><strong>W-5</strong> With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.</td>
<td><strong>W-5</strong> With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; take brief notes on sources and sort evidence into provided categories.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; take notes, and categorize information, and provide a list of sources.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; summarize or paraphrase information in notes and finished work, and provide a list of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 6-8 Summative Assessment Targets, Claim #2

**ELA/Literacy Claim # 2**
Students can produce effective writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources; assess the credibility of each source; and quote or paraphrase the data and conclusions of others while avoiding plagiarism and providing basic bibliographic information for sources.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, using search terms effectively; assess the credibility and accuracy of each source; and quote or paraphrase the data and conclusions of others while avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation.</td>
<td><strong>W-8</strong> Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, using search terms effectively; assess the credibility and accuracy of each source; and quote or paraphrase the data and conclusions of others while avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td><strong>W-9</strong> Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-3a</strong> Vary sentence patterns for meaning, reader/listener interest, and style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-3b</strong> Maintain consistency in style and tone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target 7. COMPOSE FULL TEXTS:** Write full arguments about topics using a complete writing process attending to purpose and audience: establish and support a claim; organize, elaborate, and cite supporting evidence from credible sources; provide appropriate transitional strategies for coherence; and develop a conclusion that is appropriate to purpose and audience and follows from and supports the argument(s) presented.

**Gr. 6 Standards:** W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1d, W-1e, W-4, W-5, W-8, W-9
(DOK 4)

**W-1**

a. Introduce claim(s) and organize the reasons and evidence clearly. Support claim(s) with clear reasons and relevant evidence, using credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.

b. Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant evidence, using accurate, credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.

**Gr. 7 Standards:** W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1d, W-1e, W-4, W-5, W-8, W-9
(DOK 4)

**W-1**

a. Introduce claim(s), acknowledge alternate or opposing claims, and organize the reasons and evidence logically.

b. Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant evidence, using accurate, credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.

**Gr. 8 Standards:** W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1d, W-1e, W-4, W-5, W-8, W-9
(DOK 4)

**W-1**

a. Introduce claim(s), acknowledge and distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and organize the reasons and evidence logically.

b. Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant evidence, using accurate, credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.

* More than one text may be needed to assess this standard.
### Grade 6-8 Summative Assessment Targets, Claim #2

**ELA/Literacy Claim # 2**

Students can produce effective writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to clarify the relationships among claim(s) and reasons.</td>
<td>c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to create cohesion and clarify the relationships among claim(s), reasons, and evidence.</td>
<td>c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to create cohesion and clarify the relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Establish and maintain a formal style.</td>
<td>d. Establish and maintain a formal style.</td>
<td>d. Establish and maintain a formal style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from the argument presented.</td>
<td>e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.</td>
<td>d. Establish and maintain a formal style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**W-4** Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.

**W-5** With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.

**W-8** Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources; assess the credibility of each source; and quote or paraphrase the data and conclusions of others while avoiding plagiarism and providing basic bibliographic information for sources.

**W-9** Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) • In a language other than English • Off-topic • Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dear citations or attribution of source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the opinion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conventions | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
In a language other than English  
Off-topic  
Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**
- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
## 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) • In a language other than English • Off-topic • Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</td>
<td>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</td>
<td>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</td>
<td>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) • In a language other than English • Off-topic • Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conventions | **The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:**  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | **The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:**  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | **The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:**  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | **Insufficient (includes copied text)**  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
## Rubric Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear, Consistent, Effective, Logical, Strong, Appropriate, Comprehensive, Specific</td>
<td>Clear, Adequate, General, Generally appropriate</td>
<td>Somewhat unclear, Insufficient, Inconsistent, Weak, Uneven, Somewhat ineffective, Imprecise, Vague, Repetitive</td>
<td>Confusing, Ambiguous, Brief, Few or no, Missing, Extraneous, Unclear, Minimal, Irrelevant, Absent, Incorrect, Copied, Ineffective, Limited, Infrequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 16-25 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.
The full write essay indicates that the student understands how to organize and establish purpose for an opinion paper. This response has an evident organizational structure and sense of completeness that is adequately sustained across the full write essay. The minor flaws that keep it from being consistently and purposefully focused do not interfere with the overall coherence. The student sets up an organizational structure to provide support to the three reasons noted in the introduction and summarized in the conclusion, but there is no part of the essay dedicated to discussing how the A.D.A.’s new rules are “more helpful.” As such, the introduction and conclusion could be stronger to anchor the paper and to fully set the reader up to enter and exit the student’s response. The progression of ideas and transitions used across the essay could be made stronger to clarify the relationships between and among ideas.
### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
  • opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
  • consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
  • effective introduction and conclusion  
  • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
  • opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
  • adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas  
  • adequate introduction and conclusion  
  • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
  • opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
  • inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
  • introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
  • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:  
  • opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
  • few or no transitional strategies are evident  
  • introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
  • frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas maybe randomly ordered or have an unclear progression | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |
The full write essay provides uneven and cursory support for the opinion and insufficient use of source material. The student attempts to support the opinion with evidence from only one of the possible sources, and does not select the most effective detail to cite from that source. The student elaborates on details from the sources using an overabundance of personal opinions and interpretation: “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.” The student’s writing style is evident, and techniques are used to engage the reader. However, the student could use more precise vocabulary to strengthen his or her stance.
## Grade 5 Evidence and Elaboration: Score 2

### OPINION PERFORMANCE TASK: SERVICE ANIMALS — STUDENT SAMPLE A

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | 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:  
  - comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific  
  - clear citations or attribution of source material  
  - effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*  
  - vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose  
  - effective, appropriate style enhances content | 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:  
  - 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 | 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:  
  - 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 | 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:  
  - 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 | 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*
There is an adequate command of conventions across this full write essay. Holistically, this response has minimal errors that are high level and do not distract from its readability. Of the minimal conventions errors, most are spelling errors on a small set of words and are few in proportion to the amount of writing completed.
# 2-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling |  
- Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |
The production of pennies has been a largely discussed topic for the past few years. The country is trying to decide whether or not the penny is worth producing anymore. The production cost of pennies is up to twice its worth but so are many other coins. Is it really worth getting rid of if all it will do is lower a few production costs? The United States should continue to produce pennies because there is much more worth to pennies than you would think.

Washington Middle School recently hosted an annual Penny Drive for charity. With everyone’s assistance, they were able to raise $3000 in one week. Many people do not see the value in pennies, but it clearly adds up. Things wouldn’t have been the same at WMS if it had been a quarter or a dime, just because they have more value.

Washington Middle School isn’t the only place that found out something new about the penny. Inflation could be a new problem on the rise. Without the penny, retailers will have to either round up or down on their prices, and it will most likely be up, claims Mark Weller, Americans for Common Cents spokesperson. This isn’t the only expense that losing the penny will cost us. Mark Weller also claims that “rounding tax” will cost us $600 million per year.

Is getting rid of the penny really worth all the trouble we will have to go through? Rounding prices cannot be done fairly, so it would simple be easier to find a way to lower production costs. We have done it before, surely we can do it again. Another reason the penny is necessary to keep is because it is actually worth so much more than you think. Ask the kids at Washington Middle School. They have clearly been able to put the penny to good use. The United States should continue to produce pennies because eliminating pennies will cost the nation so much more to get rid of them than to keep them.
Based on the organization and purpose rubric, the student receives a score of 3. The student has a strong introduction to the topic in which the claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and strongly maintained for the purpose, audience, and task. The student concludes the response in an effective way. The student uses some transitions, including one effective example in which the student discusses a school fundraiser in paragraph two, then begins paragraph three with the following transition: “Washington Middle School isn’t the only place that found out something about the penny.” However, the use of transitional strategies could have been more effectively used to clarify differences between ideas. While the student demonstrates a logical progression of ideas from beginning to end, the connections between ideas are only adequate and do not always flow smoothly. Opposing arguments are acknowledged throughout the essay, but not always in an effective order. The counterclaim is insufficient because it consists of one statement that is not supported by evidence from the sources: “Many people do not see the value in pennies, but it clearly adds up.”
### 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
• claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
• effective introduction and conclusion  
• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety  
• alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed* | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
• claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas  
• adequate introduction and conclusion  
• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas  
• alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed* | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
• claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas  
• alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged* | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:  
• claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
• few or no transitional strategies are evident  
• introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
• frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression  
• alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged* | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
Based on the evidence and elaboration rubric, this student receives a score of 3. The student effectively integrates summarized evidence from the sources, but only references one source directly. It is often difficult to determine the difference between evidence and elaboration. The student’s style of writing is evident in the use of voice throughout the piece, and the student demonstrates adequate use of elaborative techniques. The vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose.
# 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Evidence/Elaboration** | The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:  
- 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 | The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:  
- 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 | The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:  
- 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 or may rely on emotional appeal  
- vocabulary is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose  
- inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style | The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:  
- 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*; emotional appeal may dominate  
- vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose  
- little or no evidence of appropriate style | 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 argument(s).

**General layered elaboration: A sentence-to-sentence progression of source-based arguments, facts, details, and/or source-based evidence that generally develops and supports the claim. Source-based evidence, if present, may be in the form of general or imprecise references. Re-ordering of the text might impair the connection of ideas.
The student receives a score of 2 in the area of conventions. The student demonstrates solid use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and spelling, and the ratio of mistakes to the overall writing is low.
### 2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONS</td>
<td>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions: &lt;br&gt;• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions: &lt;br&gt;• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions: &lt;br&gt;• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) &lt;br&gt;• In a language other than English &lt;br&gt;• Off-topic &lt;br&gt;• Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
from my perspective I think from source #3 “once the new rules went into effect the only service animals permitted in public places were dogs and miniture horses.” and “for example birds could leave droppings on a store floor.” That’s why I chose animals that are permitted are only aloud in certain places. cause if I was at a restaurant and there was a boa constrictor I wouldn’t be satisfied in my food anymore and definitely I’d lose my appetite when I go to my favorite restaurant I don’t want to see any gross animals because I suddenly would not want my favorite food anymore. In source #3 it says Different animals carry certain diseases.” one example if I sat next to a pet and they let my pet if it would have a disease and that would be bad.
This response has no discernible organizational structure and provides little focus.

The student attempts to give an opinion by stating, “That’s why I chose animals that are permitted are only aloud in certain places.” However, the opinion is ambiguous. There is no introduction or conclusion, and there are only a few attempts to include transitions (e.g., “cause”). There is an uneven progression of ideas in the response. The student begins by discussing birds leaving droppings (“birds could leave droppings”), then jumps to how eating next to a snake could cause appetite loss (“I’d lose my appetite”). The student then discusses that “Different animals carry certain diseases,” which may be related to birds leaving droppings, but, if so, the response does not clarify the connection. While all of these topics somewhat relate to the student’s opinion statement, there are no clear progressions between and among these ideas.

Holistically, the best score for this response is a 1.
4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE</td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>• opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• adequate use of transitional strategies and some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>• few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td>Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>• introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td>Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas maybe randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response does not include an appropriate level of elaboration or an appropriate amount of evidence to support a score above 1. The student’s attempts to cite source material is limited; the response only includes evidence from a single source (source 3), and such evidence is not well incorporated into the description of an overall opinion (i.e., source evidence is predominantly copied). There is a weak attempt to employ elaborative techniques, evidenced by the fact that the whole paper focuses on personal opinion without connecting ideas. In addition, the vocabulary is not particularly effective for the purpose because the words do not help to convey ideas with precision and there is little/no evidence of appropriate style.
### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Evidence/Elaboration** | 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:  
- comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific  
- clear citations or attribution of source material  
- effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*  
- vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose  
- effective, appropriate style enhances content | 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:  
- 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 | 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:  
- 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 | 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:  
- 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 | 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
The student response demonstrates little to no command of conventions. Each sentence has multiple errors in structure, punctuation, and spelling. These errors substantially detract from the response's overall readability. Overall, a score of 0 is most appropriate for this response.
# 2-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

Grade 5 Conventions: Score 0

OPINION PERFORMANCE TASK: SERVICE ANIMALS — STUDENT SAMPLE B
STUDENT RESPONSE

Pennies should still live because let's say that you have five dollars and you need change for one penny where you going to get that one penny if that doesn't exist and plus if you eliminate pennies people will go nuts and pennies have been around for 200 years you can't just throw something away that's been part of our lives for 200 years, I'm on both sides but mostly on keeping the pennies instead of eliminating them. The coin also gave rise to the terms like “penny candy” a piece of candy sold for one cent and penny arcade an amusement center with machines that cost one cent to operate. This amazing effort was made possible due to the power of the penny. Many people do not see the value in the penny, and they feel as though pennies are not worth the trouble of carrying them around. Pennies might be a little bulky, but they add up moreover, because they are worth so little, people don't mind donating them to charity.
Based on the organization and purpose rubric, this student receives a score of 1. The student's position is clear, but the support for the claim is not logically argued. There are transitions within ideas ("also," "but," "because"), but the transitions between different ideas are not fully developed, making the supporting evidence difficult to follow; the latter half of the student's writing consists of a series of uncited quotations. The student attempts to include an originally worded introduction, but it is weak and difficult to support. The conclusion is missing. The student's counterclaim is another uncited quotation without explanation.
## 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE</td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused: • claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience • consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • effective introduction and conclusion • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety • alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused: • claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience • adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas • adequate introduction and conclusion • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas • alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus: • claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience • inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety • introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas • alternate and opposing argument(s) are not acknowledged*</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus: • claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience • few or no transitional strategies are evident • introduction and/or conclusion may be missing • frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression • alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged*</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) • In a language other than English • Off-topic • Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
Based upon the evidence and elaboration rubric, this student receives a score of 1. Although the student includes several pieces of evidence, the lack of elaboration and references means that this evidence is not integrated into a coherent argument. The use of vocabulary is ineffective for the audience and purpose, and includes phrases such as, “Pennies should still live,” and “people will go nuts.” Given the limited original text, there is little evidence of the student’s mastery of stylistic elements for the purpose and audience.
4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evidence/Elaboration | The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language: | The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language: | The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language: | The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing: | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |
|          | • 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 | • 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 | • 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 or may rely on emotional appeal  
• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose  
• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style | | |

* Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).

**General layered elaboration: A sentence-to-sentence progression of source-based arguments, facts, details, and/or source-based evidence that generally develops and supports the claim. Source-based evidence, if present, may be in the form of general or imprecise references. Re-ordering of the text might impair the connection of ideas.
Based upon the conventions rubric, this student earns a score of 0. Only the first half of the response is considered when assigning a score, since the latter half is copied text. The student makes a variety of errors in sentence formation, punctuation, and capitalization. While the student demonstrates an adequate command of correct spelling and grammar usage, the response has a high proportion of errors to text written correctly, which makes it more difficult to understand the student’s writing.
# 2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
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 Rescue 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 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.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2
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.
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 have a service animal should walk in a shoporest aint and not be told, “Sorry only dogs and miniature horses allowed”, because if you have a service animal (besides a dog or miniature horse) to comfort you or help you, you might have to ask someone 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.
Should We Keep the Penny?

Should we keep the penny? My thought on this yes, we should keep the penny. There are many things that would be effected if we got rid of it. For example if we got rid of the penny then the amount of money for things would be rounded up or down. “... a lunch bill comes out to $9.06, it would be rounded down to $9.05. If it was $9.09, it would be rounded up to $9.10,” This was stated in the second source. But this would be more like a tax because most stores would round up more often then not so this would cost people $600 million each year. The penny is a big part of our history too. “The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large...” The penny has changed over the years with us. It is also in many popular idioms. “a penny for your thoughts’... ‘not one red cent.’” Also somethings for example penny candy.

But the counter argument would also have points. The penny does cost more to make than it’s worth, but that can be fixed by changing how it’s made. Also most of the time people refuse to have it in change and don’t normally use them.

But I still think we should keep the penny. I feel this way because they add up. A penny drive “...raised over $3000 in one week!” They raised this much money because people will willingly give up pennies because you can’t buy much with them. So donating them adds up to a lot of money. But if you had a quarter drive not many people will donate because you can do stuff with quarters.

In conclusion I feel we should keep the penny. Its a big part of our history and is used in common phrases. It maybe more expensive to make than it’s worth but that can be fixed by being made out of different things. Saving up pennies can really add up. We truly need the penny.
Why should we keep the penny when it costs more than it is worth? The obvious solution would be to simply remove the penny. “The United States government...lost 60.2 million on the production and distribution of pennies... in the 2011 fiscal year...and the losses have been mounting” (Sommer). It is clearly foolish to continue making pennies when we are losing millions each year, millions that could be used to better people’s lives. Instead we waste it on minting out coins that are only worth one cent.

The main reason why we should remove the penny is that it wastes both time and money. “His study shows that the time wasted on counting pennies could add up to $700 million per year...” (Mancuso). The time spent counting pennies should be used much more productively and imagine if those businesses could donate $700 million to charity.

Even the Department of Defense doesn’t use pennies anymore. “For over 30 years, pennies haven’t been used on foreign military bases. Pennies are ‘too heavy and are not cost effective to ship’ “ (Mancuso). It is a complete waste to continue using pennies, and even the military agrees. If such a major part of our government refuses to use pennies, the rest of us should take the hint.

Some people think that removing the penny is not a good idea in fears of inflation and economic problems. This is not the case. “A number of countries, including Australia, new Zealand, brazil, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Britain, have already dropped their lowest-denominated coins, without dire consequences” (Mancuso). If all of these countries can drop their lowest value coin without their economy collapsing, it seems reasonable to assume that we would be fine too. Even more proof is that Canada has stopped minting out pennies, and with all of our cultural, economic, and political similarities it would seem that it may be best for us to stop penny-producing too.(Mancuso). If Canada has found enough valid reasons to stop minting the penny, then we should follow their example.

Ceasing production of the penny would save millions of dollars and time, and could make people’s lives better. Fears of economic collapse are unfounded. The clear course of action is to remove the penny.
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 Rescue 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.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2
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.
The student's response has a clear and effective organizational structure that is maintained from beginning to end.

The opinion is conveyed in a purposeful way in the introduction; the elaboration follows a logical progression of ideas; and it is reiterated clearly in the conclusion. The question in the introduction (“Did you know that people with disabilities are limited to the kind of service animals they can have in public places?”) effectively introduces the topic and serves to hook the reader.

The transitional strategies are varied, and the repeated use of the numbering strategy in the second and third paragraphs (“First off,” “Secondly”) give the response a cohesive feel.

Overall, the organizational structure supports a strong response and earns a score of 4.
## 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
- opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
- effective introduction and conclusion  
- logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
- opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas  
- adequate introduction and conclusion  
- adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
- opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
- inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
- uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:  
- opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
- few or no transitional strategies are evident  
- introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
- frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas maybe randomly ordered or have an unclear progression | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
In a language other than English  
Off-topic  
Off-purpose |
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 Rescue Center . . . .” In addition, comprehensive evidence is provided to support the idea that other service animals should not be included in this law. 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 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.

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 the 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.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td>• Insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear citations or attribution of source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• little or no attempt to create appropriate style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea.
The student's response demonstrates a strong command of conventions. There are a minor spelling errors, but these do not affect the readability of the opinion piece and are proportionally very few when compared to the amount of words with complex spelling patterns that are spelled correctly. The response includes a variety of sentence formations which enhance its overall style and demonstrates that the student understands rules of grammar, punctuation, and capitalization. Overall, the response earns a score of 2.
# 2-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |
Grade 5 Opinion Performance Task: Service Animals
STUDENT SAMPLE D

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.
This response has an organizational structure that is inconsistent and only somewhat sustained.
The opinion is stated in the introduction ("I disagree with the new rule") but lacks explanation regarding what the rule is, thus weakening the introduction. The conclusion reiterates the opinion with more detail than the introduction, but the wording is a unclear ("... 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.").
The focus is insufficiently sustained for the audience and purpose. The second paragraph attempts to communicate the idea that people who have service animals other than dogs or horses may need to ask a stranger for help, when in public, if their animal is not allowed, but the writer does not clarify the explanation until the end of the paragraph. Additionally, there is a drift in focus in paragraph 3 when the student discusses that the capuchin monkey is wild, then jumps to the idea that dolphins and snakes can "calm people down."

Transitional strategies are not evident, and there is an unclear progression of ideas across the response. While the topic of paragraph 2 is aligned with the opinion, paragraph 3 veers in focus, discussing how the capuchin monkey can be “wonderful” but “still wild.” The student does not connect this idea to disagreeing with the new rule.

Holistically, the best score for this response is a 2.
### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
• opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
• effective introduction and conclusion  
• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
• opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas  
• adequate introduction and conclusion  
• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
• opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or, formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:  
• opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
• few or no transitional strategies are evident  
• introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
• frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas maybe randomly ordered or have an unclear progression | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |
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, the statement 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,” “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”).

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 miniture horeses allowed.” Overall, the best score for this response is a 1.
### 4-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td>• In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear citations or attribution of source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea*
This response demonstrates a partial command of conventions. Holistically, this response has a variety of basic errors that impede the reading of the response and are proportionally significant, including errors in spelling, sentence formation, and subsequent punctuation and capitalization.
# 2-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |
STUDENT RESPONSE

Should We Keep the Penny?

Should we keep the penny? My thought on this yes, we should keep the penny. There are many things that would be effected if we got rid of it. For example if we got rid of the penny then the amount of money for things would be rounded up or down. “. . . a lunch bill comes out to $9.06, it would be rounded down to $9.05. If it was $9.09, it would be rounded up to $9.10,” This was stated in the second source. But this would be more like a tax because most stores would round up more often then not so this would cost people $600 million each year. The penny is a big part of our history too. “The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large . . .” The penny has changed over the years with us. It is also in many popular idioms. “a penny for your thoughts’ . . . ‘not one red cent’.” Also somethings for exsample penny candy.

But the counter argument would also have points. The penny does cost more to make than it’s worth, but that can be fixed by changing how it’s made. Also most of the time people refuse to have it in change and don’t normally use them.

But I still think we should keep the penny. I feel this way because they add up. A penny drive “… raised over $3000 in one week!” They raised this much money because people will willingly give up pennies because you can’t buy much with them. So donating them adds up to alot of money. But if you had a quater drive not many people will donate because you can do stuff with quaters.

In conclusion I feel we should keep the penny. Its a big part of our history and is used in common phrases. It maybe more expencive to make than it’s worth but that can be fixed by being made out of different things. Saving up pennies can really add up. We truely need the penny.
The student’s claim in this essay is clear, “Should we keep the penny? My thought on this yes, we should keep the penny. There are many things that would be effected if we got rid of [the penny]”; however, the focus of the student’s claim is insufficiently sustained throughout the essay. There is a lack of cohesion throughout the essay with few effective transitions to connect or introduce ideas. For example, the writer shifts from “if we got rid of the penny then the amount of money for things would be rounded up or down” into “The penny is a big part of our history too” and then “It is also in many popular idioms.” While the student does use some transitional phrases (“But,” “Also”), there is little variety and no particular sequence outlined through their use. The student attempts to include an alternate and opposing argument (“The penny does cost more to make than it’s worth . . . “); however, the argument is not adequately addressed or countered. The writer does include a conclusion that attempts to summarize their claim: “In conclusion I feel we should keep the penny. Its a big part of our history and is used in common phrases. It maybe more expensive to make than it’s worth but that can be fixed by being made out of different things.”

Overall, while some indicators venture into the 3 range, this is a clear example of a 2 because the response has an inconsistent organizational structure with evident flaws.
## Grade 8 Organization and Purpose: Score 2

### ARGUMENTATIVE PERFORMANCE TASK: PENNIES—STUDENT SAMPLE C

### 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
- claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
- effective introduction and conclusion  
- logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed* | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
- claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas  
- adequate introduction and conclusion  
- adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed* | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
- claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
- inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
- uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged* | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:  
- claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
- few or no transitional strategies are evident  
- introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
- frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged* | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
The student’s response earns a score of 2 because the response includes uneven support for the claim. The student includes evidence from the sources, but the student’s use of elaboration and citations is inconsistent, and the student sometimes uses simplistic language. The response includes some evidence from the sources, but the evidence is often weakly integrated. For example, the student writes: “The penny is a big part of our history too. ‘The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large . . .’ The penny has changed over the years with us. It is also in many popular idioms. ‘a penny for your thoughts’ . . . ‘not one red cent’. ‘Also somethings for example penny candy.’ While the evidence supports the student’s claim that “The penny is a big part of our history too,” the weak integration makes the support less effective. The response exhibits weak source citations, as well. The first piece of evidence, “For example if we got rid of the penny” is attributed to the second source, but this is the only instance of explicit citation in the response. All other quotations and paraphrased evidence do not reference source material, which is a weak use of citations. The student elaborates on some evidence: “The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large . . . The penny has changed over the years with us.” But in other instances, the response simply lists evidence without providing various methods of effective elaboration. Therefore, the student demonstrates a partial and uneven use of source material. The student’s own words are too limited to create an appropriate style, and the vocabulary the student uses is uneven (many words are appropriate—“counter argument,” “willingly,” “exspensive”—but others are ineffective for the audience and purpose—pronouns that do not agree with antecedents: “stuff,” “things”).
ARGUMENTATIVE PERFORMANCE TASK: PENNIES—STUDENT SAMPLE C

4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:  
  - 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  | The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:  
  - 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  | The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language.  
  - 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 or may rely on emotional appeal  
  - vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose  
  - inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style  | The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:  
  - 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; emotional appeal may dominate  
  - vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose  
  - little or no evidence of appropriate style  | **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 argument(s).

**General layered elaboration: A sentence-to-sentence progression of source-based arguments, facts, details, and/or source-based evidence that generally develops and supports the claim. Source-based evidence, if present, may be in the form of general or imprecise references. Re-ordering of the text might impair the connection of ideas.
The student demonstrates a partial command of conventions, with a number of basic errors, including several repeatedly misspelled common words (“quater”, “exsample”, and “Its”) and some examples of incorrect sentence formation, “My thought on this yes.” However, correct use of conventions is not “infrequent” and the response earns a score of 1 on the conventions rubric.
# 2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CONVENTIONS | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
Grade 8 Argumentative Performance Task: Pennies
STUDENT SAMPLE D

STUDENT RESPONSE

Why should we keep the penny when it costs more than it is worth? The obvious solution would be to simply remove the penny. “The United States government...lost 60.2 million on the production and distribution of pennies... in the 2011 fiscal year...and the losses have been mounting” (Sommer). It is clearly foolish to continue making pennies when we are losing millions each year, millions that could be used to better people’s lives. Instead we waste it on minting out coins that are only worth one cent.

The main reason why we should remove the penny is that it wastes both time and money. “His study shows that the time wasted on counting pennies could add up to $700 million per year...” (Mancuso). The time spent counting pennies should be used much more productively and imagine if those businesses could donate $700 million to charity.

Even the Department of Defense doesn’t use pennies anymore. “For over 30 years, pennies haven’t been used on foreign military bases. Pennies are ‘too heavy and are not cost effective to ship’ “ (Mancuso). It is a complete waste to continue using pennies, and even the military agrees. If such a major part of our government refuses to use pennies, the rest of us should take the hint.

Some people think that removing the penny is not a good idea in fears of inflation and economic problems. This is not the case. “A number of countries, including Australia, new Zealand, brazil, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Britain, have already dropped their lowest-denominated coins, without dire consequences” (Mancuso). If all of these countries can drop their lowest value coin without their economy collapsing, it seems reasonable to assume that we would be fine too. Even more proof is that Canada has stopped minting out pennies, and with all of our cultural, economic, and political similarities it would seem that it may be best for us to stop penny-producing too.(Mancuso). If Canada has found enough valid reasons to stop minting the penny, then we should follow their example.

Ceasing production of the penny would save millions of dollars and time, and could make people’s lives better. Fears of economic collapse are unfounded. The clear course of action is to remove the penny.
This student presents an exemplar response to the question, and this score is a clear example of a 4. The clear claim is introduced in the first two sentences: “Why should we keep the penny when it costs more than it is worth?” The obvious solution would be to simply remove the penny. The student provides a clearly focused organizational structure of why we should get rid of the penny throughout the response. There is a consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies that clarify the relationship between the ideas (“The obvious solution,” “The main reason,” “Some people think,” “The clear course of action is”), in addition to syntactic variety to logically connect ideas (“It is clearly foolish to,” “The time spent counting pennies should be used much more productively,” “it seems reasonable to assume”). Not only is the claim introduced well, but the student effectively concludes the argument stating, “Ceasing production of the penny would save millions of dollars and time, and could make people’s lives better. Fears of economic collapse are unfounded. The clear course of action is to remove the penny.” The student effectively presents the alternate argument that should be addressed, “Some people think that removing the penny is not a good idea.”
### 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ORGANIZATION/PURPOSE** | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
- claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
- effective introduction and conclusion  
- logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed* | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
- claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
- adequate use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
- uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged* | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
- claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
- inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged* | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:  
- claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
- few or no transitional strategies are evident  
- introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
- frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression  
- alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged* | ![Insufficient](https://example.com/insufficient.png) (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
The student’s response scores a 3. Although it includes comprehensive evidence from the sources, the response attributes two of those pieces of evidence to the incorrect source. This is one element that distinguishes this response from one that would score a 4. The student attributes all but one of the pieces of evidence to the second source when two of those examples (“A number of countries, including Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Britain, have already dropped their lowest-denominated coins, without dire consequences” and “Even more proof is that Canada has stopped minting out pennies, and with all of our cultural, economic, and political similarities it would seem that it may be best for us to stop penny-producing too”) should be attributed to the first source instead. Additionally, the response provides an analysis that is reasoned but not in depth, which makes the overall use of elaborative techniques adequate rather than effective. The student’s use of vocabulary and style is clearly appropriate and effective. Overall, the preponderance of evidence shows that this score is a 3: The response provides adequate elaboration of the evidence for the claim that includes reasoned analysis.
Grade 8 Evidence and Elaboration: Score 3

ARGUMENTATIVE PERFORMANCE TASK: PENNIES—STUDENT SAMPLE D

4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>4 POINTS</th>
<th>3 POINTS</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:  
  - 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 | The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:  
  - 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 | The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:  
  - 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 or may rely on emotional appeal  
  - vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose  
  - inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style | The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:  
  - 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*; emotional appeal may dominate  
  - vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose  
  - little or no evidence of appropriate style | 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 argument(s).

**General layered elaboration: A sentence-to-sentence progression of source-based arguments, facts, details, and/or source-based evidence that generally develops and supports the claim. Source-based evidence, if present, may be in the form of general or imprecise references. Re-ordering of the text might impair the connection of ideas.
This student demonstrates adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, grammar usage and spelling. There are very few errors, like errors in capitalization on some of the country names listed in paragraph four, particularly in proportion to the volume of writing done well.
## 2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>2 POINTS</th>
<th>1 POINT</th>
<th>0 POINTS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONS</td>
<td>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</td>
<td>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</td>
<td>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization,</td>
<td>• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization,</td>
<td>• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization,</td>
<td>• In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>• Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium:

English/Language Arts Practice Test Scoring Guide
Grade 5 Performance Task

5/16/2014
**Student Directions**

**Service Animals Opinion Performance Task**

**Task:**
A person with a disability visited your class today to discuss how his trained service animal allows him to enjoy more independence and participate more fully in everyday activities. You and your classmates became interested in learning more about service animals. Your teacher took your class to the school library to look up more information about this topic. You have found three articles about service animals.

After you have looked at these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly scan the sources and the three questions that follow. Then, go back and read the sources carefully so you will have the information you will need to answer the questions and complete your research. You may click on the Global Notes button to take notes on the information you find in the sources as you read. You may also use scratch paper to take notes.

In Part 2, you will write an opinion paper on a topic related to the sources.

**Directions for Beginning:**
You will now examine several sources. You can re-examine any of the sources as often as you like.

**Research Questions:**
After looking at the sources, use the rest of the time in Part 1 to answer three questions about them. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, your answers will help you think about the information you
have read and looked at, which should help you write your opinion paper.

You may click on the Global Notes button or refer back to your scratch paper to look at your notes when you think it would be helpful. Answer the questions in the spaces below the items.

Both the Global Notes on the computer and your written notes on scratch paper will be available to you in Part 1 and Part 2 of the performance task.

Part 1

Sources for Performance Task:

Source #1
You have found a current article about capuchin monkeys on a website about service animals. The author is a veterinarian who writes articles for educational publications.

Monkey Helpers
by Tamra Orr

An Unusual Set of Helping Hands
Every day people make countless moves that they tend to take for granted. They scratch their noses and pull on their backpacks. People grab something to eat and push up their glasses. They flip the pages of their textbooks and turn off their lights. For people living with injuries to the spinal cord, however, these basic movements are very difficult. For some, they are even impossible. For the past 35 years, more than 160 people with injuries to the spinal cord have found support from a very unusual set of helping hands: those of specially trained capuchin monkeys.
Capuchin monkeys are very small. Some weigh less than eight pounds, even when fully grown. They are also extremely smart. In the wild, they have shown the ability to pick up tools and use them to solve problems. Their hands can easily carry small tools. This makes it easier for them to handle modern items such as remotes and cell phones.

Although capuchin monkeys are smart and are able to handle small tools, not all types of monkeys are ideal to use as service animals. Some monkeys, such as howler monkeys, are too large or strong. Monkeys who have not been properly trained are also unreliable. They might behave in ways that are hard to predict. For example, a monkey could suddenly hurt a person if it got angry or frightened for some reason.

While some people believe capuchin monkeys are wonderful service animals, not everyone agrees. Capuchins are small, easy to train, and able to bond, or form close relationships, with humans. However, they are still, in the end, wild animals. April Truitt, director of the Primate Rescue Center in Kentucky, says that having a wild animal in your home may put both the animal and the owner at increased risk of getting injured. She points out that it is possible for capuchins to become violent suddenly and this can be a danger to their owners and others.

**Long Before School Starts**
Long before capuchin monkeys begin their training, they have already spent years around humans. Born in a Massachusetts zoo, they must live with foster families as long as twelve years before beginning their training on how to assist a person with a disability. During this time, they are taught how to share a house
with humans. They get used to being around pets. They even learn basic tasks like how to take baths. This requires a great deal of time and effort.

**Learning to Help**
Capuchin monkeys learn how to assist people with disabilities at Helping Hands, otherwise known as the monkey college, in Boston, Massachusetts. This college is not quite like going to a traditional school. Every day, for three to five years, capuchin monkeys learn new skills. Their lessons do not focus on reading and writing though. Days are spent learning how to load a DVD into a player and push play, or how to open and close microwave doors. This education takes time, patience, and money. The cost of educating just one monkey is close to $40,000. Finally, after up to five years of training, the animals finish school. Now the monkeys are ready to go and live with someone who needs them to help make life a little bit easier.

**The Simple Things**
Having a capuchin monkey in the house is not the same as having a dog or cat. Because of their training and their intelligence, these monkeys are able to do an amazing number of chores for the person who is disabled and cannot do them alone. Along with operating microwaves and DVD players, these service animals can also turn lights off and on for their new owners. They can open bottles and flip the pages of a book for their owner. They can even reach out and scratch an annoying itch.

Every year, Helping Hands places dozens of monkeys in homes of people with disabilities. The monkeys take good care of their owners. In return, the owners feel safer and more able to do tasks that so many others take for granted.
Sources Used


Source #2
You found an article about service animals in a 2002 issue of Click, a magazine for children.

Animals Helping People

A monkey who helps you drink out of a straw? A dog that opens the refrigerator door when you want a snack? A pony gentle enough to ride even if you cannot see? When people need extra care, special animals are there to help!

Seeing Eye dogs are trained to be the eyes for people who cannot see. All over the world, Seeing Eye dogs are hard at work—guiding, protecting, and loving their blind masters.
Horseback riding is good exercise. It also helps people feel happy and confident. Even riders who cannot see, or who have trouble moving their muscles, can have fun on a quiet, gentle, well-trained horse.

Hearing dogs help people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. These smart, friendly, energetic dogs are specially trained to let their owners know when the doorbell rings, the smoke alarm goes off, or the baby wakes up from a nap.

This boy needs both his hands and all his energy just to walk. Luckily, his assistance dog is there to carry his backpack. Assistance dogs are good helpers—and good friends!

An assistance dog is trained to help

... Assistance animals like this capuchin monkey are smart and nimble enough to help in lots of ways—they can turn the lights on and off, play a CD, or get their owners a cool drink!
A capuchin monkey helps with many tasks

This girl is part of a special program to help children with serious physical and learning difficulties. Swimming with dolphins helps the children relax—and who wouldn't love being around such wild and beautiful creatures!

Dolphins are calming creatures


Source #3
This article from a magazine about animal rights describes new service animal rules that are included as part of a federal law. The author is on staff at the magazine and has a legal background.
New Service Animal Rules
by Clare Mishica

New rules regarding service animals were added to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in March 2011. The ADA is a law that protects the rights of people with disabilities.

The new rules limit the kind of service animals that people with disabilities can have in public places. Now, only dogs and miniature horses are allowed in public places. The changes were meant to clear up confusion regarding service animals in public places. Business owners were unclear about the kind of service animals that were allowed in their businesses. They were also unclear about the amount of responsibility that they had for service animals that were brought into their businesses.

A man has a large snake draped over his shoulders. He wants to enter a café for lunch and says the snake is a service animal that helps and comforts him. In the past, the law would have required the café to allow the man to bring his snake inside. This was because people were allowed to choose any service animal as helpers, including pigs, birds, and lizards! Before the new rule, any type of animal could have been considered a service animal. As long as the owner felt that the animal provided him/her assistance, then any type of animal could be used as a service animal. Once the new rules went into effect, the only service animals permitted in public places are dogs and miniature horses.

What Made the Changes Necessary?
The changes were needed to protect people from
diseases. Different animals carry certain diseases. When animals go into public places, they might pass illnesses to humans. In addition, some animals are not trained to keep an area clean. For example, birds could leave droppings on a store floor. This creates an unhealthy setting for others.

Second, the law was changed to help business owners. In the past, businesses such as hotels had to accept all types of service animals, and that could create problems. For example, some animals are large or noisy. Others might cause damage or have special needs. 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.

Some people prefer to use service animals other than dogs and miniature horses and this is still possible. The new rules limit only the kind of service animals permitted in public places. In private, people are able to choose other animals. Some people with disabilities use monkeys to help them do tasks in their homes. These monkeys have similar hand and finger control to humans, so they can perform more tasks than other animals.

Would you like to learn more about the federal rules for service animals? You can visit the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) website. It gives details and reasons for changes in the rules.

Sources Used

Manning, S. (2011, April 11). Changing definitions new federal law limits service animals to dogs and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>DOK</th>
<th>Item Standard</th>
<th>Evidence Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W-8</td>
<td>The student will select evidence to support opinions based on evidence collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Elements:
People who own businesses have to consider the well-being of all of their guests:
1.   Source #3

Being smart and able to handle small objects makes certain animals more appropriate than other animals to assist people who have a disability:
1.   Source #1
2.   Source #2

Rubric:
(1 point) 3 cells completed correctly
(0 points) Fewer than 3 cells completed correctly or blank
The sources discuss how service animals help people. Explain what you have learned about how service animals help people. Use one detail from Source #1 and one detail from Source #2 to support your explanation. For each detail, include the source title or number.

**Key Elements:**

Source #1 (Monkey Helpers)
- They can carry small tools such as remotes and cell phones.
- The monkeys learn how to load a DVD into a player and push play.
- They can open and close microwave doors.
- These monkeys are able to do an amazing number of chores for a person with a disability.
- The monkeys can turn lights on and off.
- They can open bottles and flip the pages of a book.
- They can scratch an annoying itch.
- The monkeys take good care of their owners.

Source #2 (Animals Helping People)
- A dog can open the refrigerator door when you want a snack.
- Seeing Eye dogs are trained to be the eyes for people who cannot see. All over the world, Seeing Eye dogs are hard at work—guiding, protecting, and loving their blind masters.
- Hearing dogs help people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. These smart, friendly, energetic dogs are specially trained to let their owners know when the doorbell rings, or the smoke alarm goes off, or the baby wakes up from a nap.
- An assistance dog can carry a backpack.
- Assistance dogs are good helpers—and good friends!
- Capuchin monkeys can turn lights on and off, play a CD or get their owners a drink.
- Dolphins help children with physical and learning difficulties relax.

Continued on next page
Rubric:

(2 points) Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from different sources that support this idea and that explain how each detail supports the idea. Student cites the source for each detail.

(1 point) 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 detail supports the idea. Student cites the sources.

OR

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 detail 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 supports this idea and that explains how that detail supports the idea. Student cites the source.

OR

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

(0 points) Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

Exemplar:

(2 points) Service animals are trained animals that help people with disabilities. These animals help their owners do certain tasks that their owners are not able to do for themselves. Source #1 says that capuchin monkeys learn how to load DVDs into players and push play and how to open and close microwave doors. Since these monkeys are trained to do such things, they are able to help their owners who may not be able to do these tasks on their own. Source #2 says that hearing dogs can help people at home by letting the owner know when the doorbell rings or when the smoke alarm goes off. This is important because if the owner is not able to hear, then the service animal could let the owner know when important sounds happen.

(1 point) Service animals are trained animals that help people with disabilities. These animals help their owners do certain tasks that the owner is not able to do for themselves. Source #1 says that capuchin monkeys learn how to load DVDs into players and push play and how to open and close microwave doors. Since these
Continued on next page

monkeys are trained to do such things, they are able to help their owners who may not be able to do these tasks on their own.

(O points) Service animals help people in different ways.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>DOK</th>
<th>Item Standard</th>
<th>Evidence Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>W-9</td>
<td>The student will analyze digital and print sources in order to locate relevant information to support research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Elements:
Source #1 (Monkey Helpers)
- Every day, for three to five years, capuchin monkeys learn new skills.
- Days are spent learning how to load a DVD into a player and pushing play, or opening and closing microwave doors.
- The monkeys attending Helping Hands receive years of training.
- They are trained only to help with tasks that are done at home.
- Years before capuchin monkeys report to their first day of school, they have already spent years around humans.
- They live with foster families for up to twelve years.
- During this time, they are taught how to share a house with humans. They get used to being around pets. They even learn basic tasks like how to take baths.
- Capuchin monkeys are coached and trained for up to five years at Helping Hands.
- They pick up tools and use them to solve problems.

### Rubric:
(2 points) Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most helpful source AND includes two details from that source that support this evaluation and that explain why each detail supports the idea that it is the most helpful source.

(1 point) Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most helpful source AND includes one detail from that source that supports this evaluation and that explains why the detail supports the idea that it is the most helpful source.

OR

**Continued on next page**
Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most helpful source AND includes two details from that source that support this evaluation but does not explain why each detail supports the idea that it is the most helpful source.

OR

Response is an evidence-based explanation that does not identify a source or correctly identify the most helpful source but includes two details from the correct source and that explains why each detail supports the idea that it is the most helpful source.

(0 points) Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

Exemplar:

(2 points) Source #1 is the most helpful source for understanding how a service animal is trained because it describes the amount of time spent training and the different types of activities that capuchin monkeys do at the monkey college, Helping Hands. This source says that monkeys spend three to five years learning skills that will help them help people with disabilities. This shows that the monkeys receive a lot of training at Helping Hands so that they will be able to assist their owners. This source also says that at Helping Hands, monkeys learn how to do things such as loading DVDs into players and opening microwave doors. This shows that the monkeys are taught many different skills so that they can help their owner.

(1 point) Source #1 is the most helpful source for understanding how a service animal is trained because it describes the amount of time spent training and the different types of activities that capuchin monkeys do at the monkey college, Helping Hands. This source says that monkeys spend three to five years learning skills that will help them help people with disabilities. This shows that the monkeys receive a lot of training at Helping Hands so that they will be able to assist their owners.

(0 points) Source #2 is the most helpful source for understanding how a service animal is trained because it says they are trained to let their owners know when the doorbell rings, or the smoke alarm goes off, or the baby wakes up from a nap.
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Student Directions

Service Animals Opinion Performance Task

Part 2
You will now review your notes and sources, and plan, draft, revise, and edit your writing. You may use your notes and go back to the sources. Now read your assignment and the information about how your writing will be scored; then begin your work.

Your Assignment:
When your class returns from the library, your classmates begin to share what they learned about different types of service animals. They also begin to discuss the new rule that allows only dogs and miniature horses as service animals in public places. Some students agree with the rule, and some students disagree with the rule. Your teacher asks you to write a paper explaining your opinion about the new rule.

In your paper, you will take a side as to whether you agree with the rule allowing only service dogs and miniature horses in public places, or whether you disagree with the rule. Your paper will be read by your teacher and your classmates. Make sure you clearly state your opinion and write several paragraphs supporting your opinion with reasons and details from the sources. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to give the source title or number for the details or facts you use.

REMEMBER: A well-written opinion paper

- has a clear opinion.
- is well-organized and stays on the topic.
- has an introduction and conclusion.
- uses transitions.
- uses details or facts from the sources to support your opinion.
- puts the information from the sources in your own words, except when using direct quotations from the sources.
- gives the title or number of the source for the details or facts you included.
- develops ideas clearly.
- uses clear language.
- follows rules of writing (spelling, punctuation, and grammar).
Now begin work on your opinion paper. Manage your time carefully so that you can

1. plan your opinion paper.
2. write your opinion paper.
3. revise and edit the final draft of your opinion paper.

Word-processing tools and spell check are available to you.

For Part 2, you are being asked to write an opinion paper that is several paragraphs long. Type your response in the box below. The box will get bigger as you type.

Remember to check your notes and your prewriting/planning as you write and then revise and edit your opinion paper.
## 4-Point Opinion

**Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3-5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text) • In a language other than English • Off-topic • Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>• opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>• few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>• introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas maybe randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grade 5

**4-Point Opinion**

**Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td><strong>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:</strong></td>
<td><strong>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:</strong></td>
<td><strong>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:</strong></td>
<td><strong>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:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Insufficient (includes copied text)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</strong></td>
<td><strong>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</strong></td>
<td><strong>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</strong></td>
<td><strong>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</strong></td>
<td><strong>• In a language other than English</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• clear citations or attribution of source material</strong></td>
<td><strong>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</strong></td>
<td><strong>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</strong></td>
<td><strong>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Off-topic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques</strong>*</td>
<td><em><em>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques</em>; development may consist primarily of source summary</em>*</td>
<td><strong>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>• Off-purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</strong></td>
<td><strong>• generally appropriate style is evident</strong></td>
<td><strong>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</strong></td>
<td><strong>• inappropriate style</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Off-purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the opinion.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• in a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
Student Directions

Penny Argumentative Performance Task

Task:
In recent years, a heated debate has emerged about money in the United States. This particular debate is not about big economic issues, though. Surprisingly, it is about the economic pros and cons of producing and using pennies.

The controversies surrounding the production and continued use of pennies is one of the topics that will be part of an upcoming website project for your history class. As part of your initial research, you have uncovered four sources about the historical and economic impact of the penny.

After you have reviewed these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly scan the sources and the three questions that follow. Then, go back and read the sources carefully so you will have the information you will need to answer the questions and finalize your research. You may click on the Global Notes button to take notes on the information you find in the sources as you read. You may also use scratch paper to take notes.

In Part 2, you will write an argumentative essay on a topic related to the sources.

Directions for Beginning:
You will now examine several sources. You can re-examine any of the sources as often as you like.
Research Questions:
After examining the research sources, use the remaining time in Part 1 to answer three questions about them. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, your answers will help you think about the research sources you have read and looked at, which should help you write your argumentative essay.

You may click on the Global Notes button or refer back to your scratch paper to look at your notes when you think it would be helpful. Answer the questions in the spaces below the items.

Both the Global Notes on the computer and your written notes on scratch paper will be available to you in Part 1 and Part 2 of the performance task.

Part 1

Sources for Performance Task:

Source #1
The following article is from the *New York Times*, published on April 7, 2012.

**Penny Wise, or 2.4 Cents Foolish?**
by Jeff Sommer

The news from north of the border is both trivial and unsettling: they won't be making shiny new pennies in Canada anymore.

The government in Ottawa has made this decision after years of deliberation¹, for reasons that would seem to apply equally well in the United States.
"Pennies take up too much space on our dressers at home," Jim Flaherty, the Canadian finance minister\(^2\), said in a speech last month. A persuasive government brochure put it this way: "We often store them in jars, throw them away in water fountains, or refuse them as change."

Pennies cost more to produce than they are worth. They are worth so little that many Canadians don’t bother to use them at all. . . .

Do we really need pennies?

The Canadian government doesn’t think so. By the fall, it plans to stop minting them and stop distributing them through banks. It won’t actually ban them, though. Some people have grown so attached to pennies—a penny saved is a penny earned, after all—that they may want to keep using them indefinitely, and they can, the Canadian government says.

But those who can bear to part with their pennies are being encouraged to bring them to banks for eventual melting or to donate them to charities—which will presumably bring them in for melting. Electronic transactions will continue to include cents, while retail sales will be rounded up or down.

Inflation\(^3\) is sometimes cited as a threat whenever small coins are phased out. A $2.01 cup of coffee should be rounded down to $2, while $2.03 should become $2.05, for example, but retailers in the real world might raise prices more than lower them. That could cause a small, one-time inflation burst, says
François Velde, an expert on the history of small change. . . .

"But in a competitive market, you might well see price decreases," says Mr. Velde, a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago who is working this year at the Bank of France. "In a place like New York, a 99-cent price of pizza might go down to 95 cents rather than $1 to avoid crossing that higher price threshold." Over all and over time, there should be no net price effect, he says.

He finds the argument for phasing out the penny to be at least as strong in the United States as in Canada because the two nations' small coins, political history and socioeconomic culture have so much in common. "That's what makes the Canadian decision a little unsettling," he says. "Their pennies even look a lot like ours."

In the United States, the mint says, each zinc and copper coin costs 2.41 cents to produce and distribute. It costs 1.6 Canadian cents to make a penny at the mint in Winnipeg, according to Canadian government figures. (A Canadian cent is worth about 0.99 cents at the current exchange rate.) "From the standpoint of economics, that's just a total waste of money," Mr. Velde says.

Pennies may not be big money, even if you add them together. But we are paying a cost for the privilege of squirreling them away in drawers and on dressers. The United States government—that is, taxpayers—lost $60.2 million on the production and distribution of pennies in the 2011 fiscal year, the mint's budget shows, and the losses have been mounting: $27.4
million in 2010, and $19.8 million in 2009.

A number of countries, including Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Britain, have already dropped their lowest-denominated coins, without dire consequences.

What is to be done in the United States? The mint defers to Congress, and Congress hasn't told it to abolish the penny. Lawmakers have directed the mint to study ways to make small coins more cheaply. Mike White, a spokesman for the mint, says a report will be completed in December. . . .

At the very least, a change in the composition of the American penny seems likely.

In 1982, Congress authorized the Treasury to make such a change, and it did. Before then, pennies were 95 percent copper and 5 percent zinc. . . . Pennies manufactured since have been copper-plated zinc, with zinc making up 97.5 percent of the coin and copper only 2.5 percent. Steel, which was used in pennies in World War II, could be substituted next.

But why stop at the penny? It's not the only American coin that costs more than it's worth. Each nickel costs 11.18 cents to produce and distribute, the mint says, at a loss to taxpayers of $56.5 million in the last fiscal year. In its 2013 budget proposal, the Obama administration has asked for authority to alter the composition of the nickel, too. . . .

"The whole situation is ridiculous," Mr. Velde says. " . . . The serious, simple solution is to do away with
A penny for your thoughts?

1 deliberation: discussion or debate
2 Canadian finance minister: responsible for presenting the Canadian government's budget each year and helping to determine the funding levels for government departments
3 Inflation: causing prices to increase


Source #2
The following is a newspaper article published in December 2012.

Is the Penny Worth It?
by Rachel Mancuso

The United States Department of Defense doesn't think so. For over 30 years, pennies haven't been used on foreign military bases. Pennies are "too heavy and are not cost-effective" to ship," according to Chris Ward, a spokesman for the Army and Air Force Exchange Service. This idea is the topic of much discussion lately, and the US Congress is considering eliminating the penny from the United States currency system.
On foreign military bases, instead of using pennies, the shops and restaurants round to the nearest 5-cents. For example, if a lunch bill comes out to $9.06, it would be rounded down to $9.05. If it was $9.09, it would be rounded up to $9.10.

The rounding system seems to work well for the military, and some experts such as Harvard professor N. Gregory Mankiw want to do the same in the entire United States. Some people fear that rounding will end up costing people extra money. Mark Weller, Americans for Common Cents spokesperson, claims that stores will not choose to round their prices down. He claims that what he calls the "rounding tax" will cost consumers $600 million per year. Dr. Robert Whaples, a professor at Wake Forest, disagrees and does not think the economic impact of eliminating pennies will be significant.

Not only does he believe that it will have an insignificant impact on prices, but Whaples seems to think that eliminating the penny will save time too. He asserts that this time saved is even more valuable than eliminating a potential impact on rounding prices. His study says that the time wasted counting pennies could add up to over $700 million per year nationwide. To a retail business, time is money because many retail businesses pay their employees by the hour. If the retail clerk and customer spend just 2.5 seconds per transaction counting pennies, those seconds add up. Those seconds add up to an estimated $700 million in wages that businesses pay retail clerks to count pennies.

Not everyone agrees that the penny should be totally eliminated. Many argue that price-rounding cannot be
done fairly, and that finding a way to make pennies cheaper is a better approach. Steel, which was used to make pennies during World War II, would be a cheaper alternative. No matter what your stance, the penny debate is real, and the United States has to make a decision one way or the other.

¹cost-effective: producing desirable results without costing a lot of money
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Source #3
The following newspaper article examines the efforts of one school to use pennies to help a worthy cause.

Give a Penny—Save the Day!
by Ted Waterhouse

Last week, Washington Middle School (WMS) hosted its annual Penny Drive for Charity. Students from every grade brought in bags and jars of pennies, and, with everyone's assistance, they raised over $3000 in one week!

This amazing effort was made possible due to the power of the penny. Many people do not see the value in the penny, and they feel as though pennies are not worth the trouble of carrying them around.

Pennies might be a little bulky, but they add up; moreover, because they are worth so little, people don't mind donating them to charity. Students at WMS found that out for themselves last week.

If the school had organized a dime or a quarter drive, they probably would not have raised as much money. As Michael Cooper, an eighth grader, said, "If you asked for my quarters, I would have said 'no' because I use them for video games. Pennies don't really matter much, so I was happy to give them to someone who could use them." Many other students I spoke with echoed Michael's words.

Bottom line: A penny is not worth much by itself, but as WMS found out, there is power in numbers. When people put all their pennies together for a good cause, they can add up quickly, and they can truly help a
good cause. So if you don't see much value in a penny, WMS can put it to good use!
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Source #4
The following article from a general interest magazine published in 2014 explores some of the changes the penny has gone through.

**The Ever-Changed Penny**
by Maria Story

The one-cent piece, commonly referred to as the "penny," has been a part of United States history for over two hundred years. Its design has changed twenty-one times. History also shows that as the economy has changed, so has the value of the coin.

The first pennies, minted until 1857, were very large—larger than our modern day quarter and had different images of the Statue of Liberty on the front. People did not really like how big they were. Several other versions of the coin were minted before finally producing the familiar Lincoln penny in 1909. Since then, ten varieties have been minted, mostly because of changes in metal content. Changing metal content was important to try to reduce production costs⁠¹. The
U.S. Mint is still exploring additional designs and different, more cost effective, metal compositions for the penny.

The history of a penny reveals more than just a coin—it exposes a piece of American culture. The one-cent piece has influenced our language, giving us a number of idioms\(^2\), such as "a penny for your thoughts" (a way to ask what someone is thinking) and "not one red cent" (meaning no money at all). The coin also gave rise to the terms like "penny candy" (a piece of candy sold for a cent) and "penny arcade" (an amusement center with machines that cost one cent to operate).

Despite its cultural influences the penny is currently under attack. The reason? Because making money also costs money. In 2011, it cost the U.S. Mint more than 2.4 cents to produce one penny. This has led many to argue that the penny is inflating the economy and should be eliminated. However, what many people fail to also consider is that the nickel, too, costs more to produce than it is worth. In 2011, the cost for the U.S. Mint to produce a nickel was over eleven cents. Even though production costs are slightly lower today, the penny still costs the U.S. just over 1.8 cents to produce. The nickel's cost is currently 9.4 cents.

The history of the American penny is a curious one. How long it will remain a part of our spending currency is yet to be determined.

\(^1\)production costs: costs of the materials and labor needed to manufacture something
"idiom: a word or phrase that means something different from its usual meaning

References


The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information.

Key Elements:
Source #2 (Is the Penny Worth It?)
- The U.S. Department of Defense stopped using the penny on foreign military bases over 30 years ago because pennies are “too heavy and are not cost-effective to ship.”
- The foreign military bases use a pricing system that rounds transactions to the nearest 5-cents, and that rounding system seems to work well.
- Some fear that rounding will cost more for customers because of rising prices. Mark Weller says the “rounding tax” will cost consumers $600 million per year.
- Dr. Whaples study says that over $700 million is wasted per year in the United States through the time it takes retail clerks and customers to count pennies.
- Many argue that price rounding cannot be done fairly, so finding a cheaper way to make pennies is a better option for cutting the costs of the penny. One option for cutting costs is by using steel to make pennies like was done during World War II.

Rubric:
(2 points) Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from Source #2 that support this idea and that explains how each example supports the idea.
(1 point) Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides two pieces of evidence from Source #2 that support this idea but doesn't explain how each example supports the idea.
OR
Response is an evidence-based explanation that provides only one piece of evidence from Source #2 that supports this idea and that explains how that example supports the idea.

Continued on next page
(0 points) Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

**Exemplar:**

(2 points) Source #2 adds to the reader’s understanding by providing more information about why some people think the penny should be eliminated. For example, it gives the concrete example of a study done by Dr. Whaples which indicated that eliminating the penny could save over $700 million because of the time wasted counting pennies. This concrete example helps the reader understand that eliminating the penny has the potential to save a significant amount of money. In addition, Source #2 also provides more information on the reasons some people think the penny should remain. For example, many people fear that eliminating the penny and rounding prices will cause customers to have to pay more over time. This example helps the reader understand that there may be negative consequences to eliminating the penny.

(1 point) Source #2 adds to the reader’s understanding by providing more information about why some people think the penny should be eliminated. For example, it gives the concrete example of a study done by Dr. Whaples which indicated that eliminating the penny could save over $700 million because of the time wasted counting pennies. This concrete example helps the reader understand that eliminating the penny has the potential to save a significant amount of money.

(0 points) Eliminating the penny could save the United States a lot of money.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>DOK</th>
<th>Item Standard</th>
<th>Evidence Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WHST-8</td>
<td>The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility of each source in order to select relevant information to support research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the sources provide information about the penny. Which source would most likely be relevant to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny? Justify your answer and support it with two pieces of information from the sources.

**Key Elements:**
Source #1 (Penny Wise, or 2.4 Cents Foolish?)
- Congress has instructed the US Mint to study ways to make the penny more cheaply.
- Congress changed the composition of the penny in 1982 to be more zinc and less copper.
- Steel was used to make pennies during World War II.
- A nickel costs more than 11 cents to produce and distribute.

**Rubric:**
(2 points) Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most relevant source AND includes two pieces of evidence from that source that support this evaluation and that explains why each piece of evidence supports the idea that it is the most relevant source.

(1 point) Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most relevant source AND includes one piece of evidence from that source that support this evaluation and that explains why the piece of evidence supports the idea that it is the most relevant source.

OR
Response is an evidence-based explanation that correctly identifies the most relevant source AND includes two pieces of evidence from that source that support this evaluation but does not explain why each piece of evidence supports the idea that it is the most relevant source.

OR
Response is an evidence-based explanation that does not identify a source or correctly identify the most relevant source but includes two pieces of evidence from

**Continued on next page**
the correct source and that explains why each piece of evidence supports the idea that it is the most relevant source.

(0 points) Response is an explanation that is incorrect, irrelevant, insufficient, or blank.

**Exemplar:**

(2 points) Source #1 is most likely to be relevant to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny because it provides the most detailed information about changes that have been made to the penny in the past to reduce costs. For example, it points out that in 1982 Congress changed the metals in the penny to contain more zinc and less copper in order to reduce the cost. Also, during WWII steel was used to make pennies instead of copper. These two pieces of information make Source #1 the most relevant source for ways to reduce the cost of producing pennies.

(1 point) Source #1 is most likely to be relevant to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny because it provides the most detailed information about changes that have been made to the penny in the past to reduce costs. For example, it points out that in 1982 Congress changed the metals in the penny to contain more zinc and less copper in order to reduce the cost. This information makes Source #1 the most relevant source for ways to reduce the cost of producing pennies.

(0 points) Source #2 is the most relevant source to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>DOK</th>
<th>Item Standard</th>
<th>Evidence Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RST-1</td>
<td>The student will cite evidence to support analyses, arguments, or critiques.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Look at the claims in the table. Decide if the information in Source #3, Source #4, both sources, or neither source supports each claim. Click on the box that identifies the source that supports each claim. There will be only one box selected for each claim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source #3: Give a Penny—Save the Day!</th>
<th>Source #4: The Ever-Changing Penny</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The penny has more value than what it can buy.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounding price totals will cause an increase in prices.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low value of a penny is a good thing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the metals in the penny is a possible solution for people who want to keep the penny.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Elements:
The penny has more value than what it can buy.
• Both
Rounding price totals will cause an increase in prices.
• Neither
The low value of a penny is a good thing.
• Source #3
Changing the metals in the penny is a possible solution for people who want to keep the penny.
• Source #4

Rubric:
(1 point) 4 cells completed correctly
(0 points) Fewer than 4 cells completed correctly, any cell incorrect, or blank.
### Student Directions

**Penny Argumentative Performance Task**

**Part 2**

You will now review your notes and sources, and plan, draft, revise, and edit your writing. You may use your notes and refer to the sources. Now read your assignment and the information about how your writing will be scored; then begin your work.

**Your Assignment:**

As a contribution to the website your history class is creating, you decide to write an argumentative essay that addresses the issues surrounding the penny. Your essay will be displayed on the website and will be read by students, teachers, and parents who visit the website.

Your assignment is to use the research sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay either for or against the continued production of the penny in the United States. Make sure you establish an argumentative claim, address potential counterarguments, and support your claim from the sources you have read. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to reference the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.

**Argumentative Essay Scoring:**

Your argumentative essay will be scored using the following:

1. **Organization/purpose:** How well did you state your claim, address opposing claims, and maintain your claim with a logical progression of ideas from beginning to end? How well did your ideas thoughtfully flow from beginning to end using effective transitions? How effective was your introduction and your conclusion?

2. **Evidence/elaboration:** How well did you integrate relevant and specific information from the sources? How well did you elaborate your ideas? How well did you clearly state ideas in your own words using precise language that is appropriate for your audience and purpose? How well did you reference the sources you used by title or number?

3. **Conventions:** How well did you follow the rules of grammar usage, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling?
Now begin work on your argumentative essay. Manage your time carefully so that you can

- plan your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.
- write your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.
- revise and edit the final draft of your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.

Word-processing tools and spell check are available to you.

For Part 2, you are being asked to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay, so please be as thorough as possible. Type your response in the space provided. The box will expand as you type.

Remember to check your notes and your prewriting/planning as you write and then revise and edit your argumentative essay.
## Grade 8

### 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>• claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>• claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>• inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>• few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>• introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>• introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>• adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>• uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas</td>
<td>• frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged*</td>
<td>• alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
### Grade 8

#### 4-Point

**Argumentative**

**Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</td>
<td>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</td>
<td>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</td>
<td>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• In a language other than English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</td>
<td>• Off-topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• Off-purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
  - adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
  - limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
  - infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling |  
  - Insufficient (includes copied text)  
  - In a language other than English  
  - Off-topic  
  - Off-purpose |

Holistic Scoring:

- **Variety**: A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- **Severity**: Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density**: The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
## Point Opinion

### Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organization/Purpose** | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused: | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused: | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus: | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus: | • Insufficient (includes copied text) 
• In a language other than English 
• Off-topic 
• Off-purpose |
<p>| | • opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience | • opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience | • opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiency sustained for the purpose and/or audience | • opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience | |
| | • consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas | • adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas | • inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety | • few or no transitional strategies are evident | |
| | • effective introduction and conclusion | • adequate introduction and conclusion | • introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak | • introduction and/or conclusion may be missing | |
| | • logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety | • adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas | • uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas | • frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear citations or an attribution of source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the opinion.
### 2-Point Opinion
Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | • Insufficient (includes copied text)  
• In a language other than English  
• Off-topic  
• Off-purpose |

#### Holistic Scoring:
- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
### 4-Point Informational
Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the topic but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>- Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- controlling/main idea of a topic is clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>- controlling/main idea of a topic is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>- controlling/main idea of a topic may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>- controlling/main idea may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>- In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>- adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>- inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>- few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td>- Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>- adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>- introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td>- Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>- adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>- uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>- frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4-Point

#### Informational

### Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominately copied</td>
<td>In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling/main idea.
## 2-Point
Informational
Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling |  
- Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

### Holistic Scoring:
- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling.
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The organization of the narrative, real or imagined, is fully sustained and the focus is clear and maintained throughout:</td>
<td>The organization of the narrative, real or imagined, is adequately sustained, and the focus is adequate and generally maintained:</td>
<td>The organization of the narrative, real or imagined, is somewhat sustained and may have an uneven focus:</td>
<td>The organization of the narrative, real or imagined, may be maintained but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- an effective plot helps to create a sense of unity and completeness</td>
<td>- an evident plot helps to create a sense of unity and completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected</td>
<td>- there may be an inconsistent plot, and/or flaws may be evident</td>
<td>- there is little or no discernible plot or there may just be a series of events</td>
<td>In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effectively establishes a setting, narrator/characters, and/or point of view*</td>
<td>- adequately establishes a setting, narrator/characters, and/or point of view*</td>
<td>- unevenly or minimally establishes a setting, narrator/characters, and/or point of view*</td>
<td>- may be brief or there is little to no attempt to establish a setting, narrator/characters, and/or point of view*</td>
<td>Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas; strong connection between and among ideas</td>
<td>- adequate use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>- uneven use of appropriate transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>- few or no appropriate transitional strategies may be evident and may cause confusion</td>
<td>Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- natural, logical sequence of events from beginning to end</td>
<td>- adequate sequence of events from beginning to end</td>
<td>- weak or uneven sequence of events</td>
<td>- little or no organization of an event sequence; frequent extraneous ideas and/or a major drift may be evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective opening and closure for audience and purpose</td>
<td>- adequate opening and closing for audience and purpose</td>
<td>- opening and closure, if present, are weak</td>
<td>- opening and/or closure may be missing or unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*point of view begins at grade 7*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>The narrative, real or imagined, provides thorough, effective elaboration using relevant details, dialogue, and/or description:</td>
<td>The narrative, real or imagined, provides adequate elaboration using details, dialogue, and/or description:</td>
<td>The narrative, real or imagined, provides uneven, cursory elaboration using partial and uneven details, dialogue, and/or description:</td>
<td>The narrative, real or imagined, provides minimal elaboration using few or no details, dialogue, and/or description:</td>
<td>- Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- experiences, characters, setting and/or events are clearly developed</td>
<td>- connections to source materials may contribute to the narrative</td>
<td>- narrative techniques are uneven and inconsistent</td>
<td>- connections to source materials, if evident, may detract from the narrative</td>
<td>- In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- connections to source materials may enhance the narrative</td>
<td>- adequate use of a variety of narrative techniques that generally advance the story or illustrate the experience</td>
<td>- use of narrative techniques may be minimal, absent, incorrect, or irrelevant</td>
<td>- connections to source materials may be ineffective, awkward, or vague but do not interfere with the narrative</td>
<td>- Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective use of sensory, concrete, and figurative language that clearly advances the purpose</td>
<td>- adequate use of sensory, concrete, and figurative language that generally advances the purpose</td>
<td>- may have little or no use of sensory, concrete, or figurative language; language does not advance and may interfere with the purpose</td>
<td>- partial or weak use of sensory, concrete, and figurative language that may not advance the purpose</td>
<td>- Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective, appropriate setting enhances the narration</td>
<td>- generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>- inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>- little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2-Point Narrative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conventions | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling |  
- Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**
- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:</td>
<td>The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:</td>
<td>The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:</td>
<td>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</td>
<td>- Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claim is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>claim is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</td>
<td>claim may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td>claim may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</td>
<td>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</td>
<td>few or no transitional strategies are evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>adequate introduction and conclusion</td>
<td>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</td>
<td>introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</td>
<td>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</td>
<td>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections among ideas</td>
<td>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have unclear progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternate and opposing argument(s) are clearly acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>alternate and opposing argument(s) are adequately acknowledged or addressed*</td>
<td>alternate and opposing argument(s) may be confusing or not acknowledged*</td>
<td>alternate and opposing argument(s) may not be acknowledged*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acknowledging and/or addressing the opposing point of view begins at grade 7.
### 4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence/Elaboration</strong></td>
<td>The response provides thorough and convincing elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) including reasoned, in-depth analysis and the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</td>
<td>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes reasoned analysis and the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise with more general language:</td>
<td>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes some reasoned analysis and partial or uneven use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</td>
<td>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the claim and argument(s) that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>• adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>• some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>• evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td>In a language other than English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>• insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>Off-topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>• weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary or may rely on emotional appeal</td>
<td>• minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate</td>
<td>Off-purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>• vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>• generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>• inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>• little or no evidence of a appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the argument(s).*

Argumentative 050814
## 2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</td>
<td>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</td>
<td>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</td>
<td>• Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>• limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>• infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</td>
<td>• In a language other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Holistic Scoring:
- **Variety**: A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- **Severity**: Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density**: The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organization/Purpose** | The response has a clear and effective organizational structure, creating a sense of unity and completeness. The organization is fully sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is consistently and purposefully focused:  
- thesis /controlling idea of a topic is clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
- effective introduction and conclusion  
- logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety | The response has an evident organizational structure and a sense of completeness. Though there may be minor flaws, they do not interfere with the overall coherence. The organization is adequately sustained between and within paragraphs. The response is generally focused:  
- thesis /controlling idea of a topic is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience  
- adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify the relationships between and among ideas  
- adequate introduction and conclusion  
- adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas | The response has an inconsistent organizational structure. Some flaws are evident, and some ideas may be loosely connected. The organization is somewhat sustained between and within paragraphs. The response may have a minor drift in focus:  
- thesis /controlling idea of a topic may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience  
- inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety  
- introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak  
- uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas | The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the topic but may provide little or no focus:  
- thesis /controlling idea may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience  
- few or no transitional strategies are evident  
- introduction and/or conclusion may be missing  
- frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |
## 4-Point Explanatory Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6–11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence/Elaboration</td>
<td>The response provides thorough elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes the effective use of source material. The response clearly and effectively develops ideas, using precise language:</td>
<td>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes the use of source material. The response adequately develops ideas, employing a mix of precise and more general language:</td>
<td>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes uneven or limited use of source material. The response develops ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</td>
<td>The response provides minimal elaboration of the support/evidence for the thesis/controlling idea that includes little or no use of source material. The response is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</td>
<td>Insufficient (includes copied text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific</td>
<td>- adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general</td>
<td>- some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied</td>
<td>- evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- clear citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>- adequate use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>- weak use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td>- insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>- adequate use of some elaborative techniques*</td>
<td>- weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary</td>
<td>- minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>- vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>- vocabulary use is uneven or somewhat ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td>- vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- effective, appropriate style enhances content</td>
<td>- generally appropriate style is evident</td>
<td>- inconsistent or weak attempt to create appropriate style</td>
<td>- little or no evidence of appropriate style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the controlling idea.
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### 2-Point

**Explanatory**

**Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conventions** | The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:  
- adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:  
- limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:  
- infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling | Insufficient (includes copied text)  
- In a language other than English  
- Off-topic  
- Off-purpose |

**Holistic Scoring:**

- **Variety:** A range of errors includes sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling
- **Severity:** Basic errors are more heavily weighted than higher-level errors.
- **Density:** The proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well. This includes the ratio of errors to the length of the piece.
Sample E

In my opinion I don’t think other service animals besides dogs and miniature horses should be aloud in public places. I say this because those other animals can leave waste on the floor in public places, can attack someone, and some people can be sensitive too some of these animals.

First, other types of service animals are not tame and they can leave waste on the floor of restaurants. In source #3 it says, “Dogs and miniature horses, however, are tame. They have been used as pets for hundreds of years...These animals can be trusted by pet owners and business owners.” It is right to allow disabled people to bring their service dogs and miniature horses with them into public places but, it is not right to allow other service animals in. Source #3 says, “In addition, some animals are not trained to keep an area clean.” It also says, “For example birds could leave droppings on a store floor.” Other types of service animals can leave waste on the floor in public places. The costemers will not want go to that place again because they will say that the restraurant lets the service animals just leave waste on the floor and they don’t clean it up. Source #3 says, “This creates an unhealthy setting for others.”

Second, other service animals can attack someone. Source #3 says that dogs and miniature horses, “They listen to commands.” But source #1 says, “She points out that it is possible for capuchins to become violent suddenly and this can be a danger to their owners and others.” Other animals might have rabies or fleas and when it bites the person it could infect them maybe causing them to have to go to the hospital to get help. But if it was a well trained dog it would just sit down and help the disabled person and listen to their commands.

Finally, some people are sensitive to birds or afraid of snakes. If someone used one of these animals as their service animal then other people wouldn’t want to go outside because they might start sneezing or get afraid. They might get afraid of snakes because they might have watched scary movies that have huge snakes in it.

In conclusion I think that only service dogs and miniature horses should be allowed in public places. I think this because of these three reasons first the animals can leave waste on the floor in public, second the service animal can attack someone, and third the service animal can make people sneeze or people might be frightened. AS you can see only service animals such as dogs and miniature horses should be allowed in public places.
I agree on the new rule that allows only dogs and miniature horses as service animals in public places. I agree on this because of the next listed paragraphs.

The first reason that I agree with the new rule is because it disturbs some people. Take a hotel for instance. In a hotel you want relaxation and peace but if a service animal, like a bird, is squaking around you get no peace or the relaxation you were looking for. This brings me to my next reason.

The second reason I agree was because of losing business. If you were in Starbucks, just happily drinking your coffee, and then you see a snake come in. Even though the snake was comforting someone, you still wouldn’t want the snake to bite you. It says in source number three that, “A man has a large snake draped over his shoulders. He wants to enter a café for lunch . . . Once the new rules went into effect, the only service animals permitted in public places are dogs and miniature horses.”

The last reason why I agree with the new rule is because of the janitorial workers. If a janitor had to pick up some animals dropping it would be an unhealthy environment to the costumers and the janitor already has enough people to pick up after.

I agree with the new rule because of how much business managers are keeping, how disturbing the service animal is and how much work they take to clean up after having in a public place.
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 its 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 a 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

I disagree with this rule for 1 not everybody has a dog or a pony and 2 people should be able to bring the service animal they feel most comfortabe with. But should some one bring a non service animal in to the store no because their not trained. Now you know my opinoin and I will tell you 3 reasons why this is my opinoin.

First if you had a different animal it could do different things like if you had a chimpanzee it could reach high stuff for you. In the article this man had a snake and he said “The snake is a service animal that helps comfort him”. And thats just one reason why other reasons there are more reasons like this next one.

Capuchin monkeys can do work for disabled people who can do them alone. Owners feel safer with monkey help even though they are dangerous.

The finale and last reason to have different service animals is the joy of doing things again because different animals allow you to do different things. Dogs can help you but with the no dogs signs don’t that mean no service dogs. Plus monkeys have paws almost like a hand and they could probably grab more things like soda straws for you to drink out of. Now if you forgot what I was talking about this will remind you.

I think with all of these details you should remember but I was giving you my opinoin on if other service animals should be allowed. And I said “I disagree with the rule for one not every one has a dog or a pony.” But now you know my opinoin on this subject and I hope you agree.
Sample E

I think they should stop making the penny. The reason is it costs more to make than its worth.

The reason I think it costs more to make than its worth is because of the facts they gave me in the sources. One example of the fact they gave me is the mint lost $56.5 million in the last year. Another fact they gave me is it 1.8 cents to produce a penny.

In conclusion those are just some facts they gave me to prove it costs more money to make a penny than its worth.
Sample C

Do we really need pennies? If we get rid of them, it certainly wouldn’t anger Jim Flaherty who says “Pennies take up too much space on our dressers at home”. It turns out, pennies cost more to make than they are worth. But, some people say a penny saved is a penny earned. There are two different sides to this story . . . what do you think?

Pennys can be very helpful to people, in many different ways including helping businesses by slowly gaining more and more money over time. But, if we get rid of the penny and round up or down accordingly, businesses would get even more money overtime. By keeping pennies, people who can afford to throw them into fountains could put them in charity boxes that will eventually add up to help people in need.

If America banned the penny it wouldn’t be the end of the world. It would hurt many organizations, and many different things. But, it would also help them, by rounding, everything would be more simple. Businesses and organizations would get more money and overall help the community.
Sample G

I think we should just stop producing pennies because it was a waste of money for example in source #2 it says “estimated $700 million in wages that businesses pay retail clerks to count pennies” that’s a lot of money just for counting pennies!

Another reason I think the government should stop making pennies is we are not making a profit when making the pennies we are losing money little by little for example in source #4 it says “just over 1.8 cents to make a penny.” This is telling you by each penny they are making they are losing about 0.8 cents and so on top of the 700 million dollars they are wasting they are also losing a total of 0.8 cents each penny they are making. A lot of people that I know don’t even use pennies they just throw them away.

I think somebody would disagree with me by saying the penny should keep being produced because at some cases you might need the penny in case something is 5.04 dollars but you only have 5.03 dollars that penny could be very useful but I could disagree with that person because even some workers at stores don’t really care if you don’t have that penny. And the government is just losing money out of making pennies that is why I think the penny should stop being made.
After reading all of this, I believe that we should keep the penny in the United States of America’s currency. I think this because why take it away after all the time we’ve had it in our country. Why should we take them away when our lives aren’t being severely affected by the creation of the penny, so what if it takes us 20 seconds to find a penny in our purse or satchel. Americans have gotten so lazy in the past couple of years and that’s why this is even a topic. Americans are too lazy to go into their purse and look for a penny.

Pennies and quarters aren’t much but they are worth something, and if you have one hundred pennies then that’s enough to buy a McDonald’s dollar menu meal for a homeless person. Americans have gotten to a point where people actually spend time writing about this. In my 14 years on this earth, this is the first time I’ve ever heard anyone even think about eliminating the penny. No one thinks the penny is worth our time and effort to even start any controversy on, rather than eliminating the penny.” I think it would be a better argument if a lot of people were in agreement with this and thought it was too strenuous to find a penny in their purse, but no.

Whenever I’m at the store with my mom or Dad they always manage to find a extra penny, or they take one from the take-one-leave-one jar.

I think that there are things more important to worry about in our world than pennies and how we should eliminate them. If we did happen to eliminate all the pennies in the world it would be impossible to destroy all of them. Why would we go through the struggle of finding and destroying all the pennies in the world, for one reason, saving time?
### Analyzing Student Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Sample E</th>
<th>Sample F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three specific strengths:</td>
<td>Three specific areas for improvement (circle the greatest need):</td>
<td>What knowledge or skill gaps might cause the specific issues you identified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Handout 3.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Sample G</th>
<th>Sample H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three specific strengths:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three specific areas for improvement (circle the greatest need):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What knowledge or skill gaps might cause the specific issues you identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What patterns of strength did you see across samples?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What areas for improvement did you see across samples?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What knowledge or skill gaps might cause these issues you identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I enjoyed learning all about you! You gave so many interesting details about your sister, and your pet lizard, and your dad’s great cooking! You put your ideas in order and used lots of sensory words that helped me really understand all about your life. Using some transition words from the list we made will help your paragraphs flow together even more! Thank you for sharing with us.
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Additional Resources

Designing for Deeper Learning:
How to Develop Performance Tasks for the Common Core

Recommended Performance Task Banks

General

Buck Institute of Education
www.bie.org/project_search
The Buck Institute has a curated bank of projects, both heir own, and those they have collected from other developers. Many of these projects include assessments and assessment tools, like rubrics. The bank is searchable by CCSS standards. Also, (www.bie.org/objects/documents) has great teacher resources for project based learning like planning forms, rubrics, group work contracts, etc.

English/Language Arts

Literacy Design Collaborative
www.literacydesigncollaborative.org
Bank of teacher-created modules that were created with CCSS-aligned LDC templates, which are explicitly CCSS aligned. Rubrics are also included. (Mostly 6-12 but beginning to branch into K-5).

Reading and Writing Project
http://readingandwritingproject.org/resources/assessments/reading_writing_assessments
Offers CCSS-aligned performance assessments for grades K-8. Tasks are designed as on-demand but could be adapted to become curriculum-embedded. Tasks include rubrics.

History/Social Studies

Stanford History Education Group: Beyond the Bubble
https://beyondthebubble.stanford.edu/
This site, produced by the Stanford History Education Group, has short constructed response assessments (HATs) that focus on particular historical skills. Free registration is required to download assessments and rubrics at this site, but the resources are well worth it (Grades 6-12).

College Board Advanced Placement Essay Questions

  (copy and paste the URL into your web browser)
  Find Free Response questions (that include documents) and accompanying scoring systems for World History from the past two years.
  You can browse the list of home pages for all courses to pick a social science course and find a released sample test and other resources. These assessments may need adaptation as they are designed to be on-demand tests for AP courses, but they can provide a good starting point.
Washington State OSPI-Developed Assessments  
http://www.k12.wa.us/SocialStudies/Assessments/default.aspx
Produced by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction of the state of Washington (in 2008), this collection of K-12 assessments includes one page of CCSS-aligned prompts and rubrics for civics, economics, geography, history and international perspectives.

Math

Mathematics Assessment Project (MAP)  
http://map.mathshell.org
The Mathematics Assessment Project (MAP) features updated MARS tasks, lessons, tests, rubrics, professional development, all aligned to the Common Core. Created by UC Berkeley, Shell Center, and University of Nottingham.

Connecticut Academic Performance Test (Released Items)  
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/csde/cedar/assessment/capt/released_items.htm#2
The Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) is one of the early pioneers of high quality performance tasks. Though these are designed for standardized administration, the tasks provide great starters for curriculum embedded tasks.

West Virginia Department of Education—Teach 21  
http://wvde.state.wv.us/teach21/pbl.html
Teach 21 is a bank of projects written and developed by West Virginia teachers, vetted by peers and other curriculum partners.

Science

Stanford Education Assessment Laboratory (SEAL)  
http://web.stanford.edu/dept/SUSE/SEAL/
This site contains 14 primarily physical science performance assessments. The topics range from electricity, friction, and incline planes (physics); mystery powders and floating/sinking (chemistry); and rocks and astronomy (earth science). Each assessment contains the student directions, teacher instructions, scoring system, and cost of materials.

Performance Assessment Links in Science (PALS)  
PALS is a task bank of science performance assessments compliend by SRI International for grades K-12 and represent a large number of performance assessment developers. Go to the site and select the grade band you are interested in, then select course (physical, life, earth/space, and science/technology). Then select the specific topic of the performance assessments. Most assessments have the student and teacher materials, a scoring system, and a sample of student work. This is a great resource.

Connecticut State Department of Education

• http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2618&q=320892
This site provides sample laboratory investigations as well as performance assessments focusing on scientific issues in society. The site includes sample performance assessments in 6 stand areas focusing on Energy Transformations; Chemical Structures and Properties; Global Interdependence; Cell Chemistry and Biochemistry; and Genetics, Evolution and Biodiversity. Each assessment contains teacher and student materials.

© 2014 Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE)

**Further Readings**

**General**


**History**


**Other Resources**

For additional resources related to performance assessment, we encourage you to browse the websites of SCALE’s partner organizations. A full list of partners and descriptions of their work can be found [here](https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/publications/pubs/1200).