


# Service Animals

## ELA Grade 5 Opinion Annotated Anchors



**Note:** All released anchors come from the Pilot Test, which did not specifically ask students to cite sources or to use multiple sources. Current Performance Tasks specifically tell students to use multiple sources and to attribute information to reference materials.

**Note:** The sources on the pilot test differed from those on the practice test. The pilot test included a video. Information from the video was the basis for Source #1 on the practice test.

# PURPOSE/ORGANIZATION



## Response

**I think that other animals should be aloud in public.**

I think that other animals should be aloud in public because they can be helpful in handing people things and being freindly like it is writenin the following passeges.

In the first passege it is writin that a monkey helps a man in a whilechair by handing him cool drinks,playing a CD and turning the lights on and of.

In the second passage their was a girl that needed help swimming. So a group of dolphins helped her swim. And that is why **I think that other animals should be aloud in public.**

## SCORE POINT

1

The opinion is clearly stated within a brief introduction that explains what the support will be. There is a brief, repetitive conclusion (*other animals should be aloud in public*). The first brief support maintains the focus of the response, but the second support (*So a group of dolphins helped her swim*) does not maintain the focus (dolphins are not the kind of service animal that would accompany an owner in public). There is no discernible progression of ideas: the support offered seems random with no sentence-to-sentence cohesion. The brevity of the response further confirms the score of 1.

## Response

## SERVICE ANIMAL LAWS

To me this law will help out a lot of people it will prevent accidents and disruptions animals such as a monkey or a snake has learned to know and like its owner. but when it comes to other peolpe the animals don't know them as well or at all and no matter how much you train them there wild you can't change that. That means your puting everyone around you in danger just because you didn't want a dog as a service animal and to me that's just being selfish. Dogs can be helpful in many ways a dog is a great choice dogs are caring and loving animals that don't want to hurt people. Dogs might be annoying sometimes when there barking or they want to play but to me it's all worth it in the end. A program like Helping Hands will make sure the animals will fit your needs. Plus if there trained well enough they'll do a lot better in public places than a regular dog this means your bestfriend gets to be with you all the time to make sure your needs are fitted and you have to make sure there needs are fitted plus you don't have to be imbaresesd around a dog. When family comes to visit you don't have to worry about puting them in danger.

To me this was a very well thought out law I think it probaly took a while to pass. This law change was needed for many diffrent reasons I've discused most of them except one you see a lot of wild animals have diseases so if you had a wild animal with a disease you could get it so you could pass it around to people and the animal could pass it around to other people espescily if you go to public places. So thats a very good reason to make that law. plus if you went to a hotel and your service animal was a horse that would be a problem so in coclusion the best sevice animal to me is a dog.

## SCORE POINT

1

This response has an introduction that lacks clarity (*To me this law will help out a lot of people it will prevent accidents*), and the conclusion (*...so in conclusion the best service animal to me is a dog*) is tacked on to the end of a sentence that also contains a new reason (horses in hotels would be a problem). Despite a [laudable] attempt to develop ideas beyond just repeating what's in the source materials, a clear focus is unevenly sustained with some loosely connected ideas that leave the reader somewhat confused in places. For example, the response nicely connects some ideas ([because some service animals are wild] *that means your putting everyone around you in danger....just being selfish*). However, in other places, the loosely connected details seem random (*...dogs are caring and loving animals that don't want to hurt people. Dogs might be annoying sometimes when there barking or they want to play but to me it's all worth it in the end.*) There is almost no transition between paragraphs 1 and 2, leading readers to suspect that the second paragraph was an afterthought more than a part of a plan for a well-organized opinion article. Overall, the focus of this response is not sustained enough to merit a higher score.

## Response

I think that the new law is very reasonable.

One reason is, because people can get diseases from a snake or a pig. This law protects people from getting sick and is a trouble to their owners who carry them around everyday.

This law also shelters people from danger. If someone were to take a snake into a resturant, it could swallow someone whole! But, if the rule were to stay peole would stay unharmed.

A dog also sits quietly at shows and other things so the

Besides, this law doesn't enforce that you can't have a service animal anywhere, so you can still have a monkey or a bird in your home helping you, you just can't have them in public places.

That is why I think that the law should stay.

## SCORE POINT

2

The response provides a brief introduction and conclusion that state (and repeat) a simplistic opinion. The body of the article begins with a clear focus but that focus is not fully sustained; minor drifts are evident (*This law protects people from getting sick and is a trouble to their owners who carry them around everyday*, and [a snake] *could swallow someone whole!*). Some transitions are present (*also; But; Besides*), and the response has a sense of completeness although not enough for a score higher than 2.

**Response**

The Law

By: Sidney

In this opinion article, I will be telling you my opinion about the service animal law that was made in 2011. It states that only service dogs can be used as pets in public places. I think it should be different because of many reasons. Here are some of them.

I think that the law should be changed because people with disabilities should be able to choose what service animal they take into public places with them. I also think that the service animals need to be checked by a veterinarian to make sure that the animal doesn't carry a disease around in public places. I think this because people with disabilities should have the right to choose a service animal they are comfortable with. Here are some of the reasons people might want different service animals.

Some service animals can perform more complicated tasks than others. Most people choose their service animal, so that they can be comfortable with it. For example, a service can't get their master a drink, like a monkey can. Service animals have many tasks that they help their master accomplish. For example, they help with everyday tasks, or they just comfort their master. Some people chose lizards, snakes, pigs, birds, cats, monkeys, and dogs as their comforting service animals.

I understand the fact that people don't want animals with diseases in public places, but the owner needs to be comfortable with their service animal. That's why the law should be like it was before it was changed in 2011.

## 3

## SCORE POINT

This response has an opening that demonstrates an emerging sense of effective introductions: it states the opinion and provides enough context – what the law states – to inform the reader, something lacking in many of the lower level responses. Some vagueness (*it should be different; Here are some of them*) combined with the unnecessary and repetitive phrases (*In this opinion article and I will be telling you my opinion...*) show that this awareness of effective introductions is still maturing.

The response has some appropriate transitions, but sometimes the connections interfere with coherence. For example, *I also think that the service animals need to be checked by a veterinarian to make sure that the animal doesn't carry a disease around in public places. I think this because people with disabilities should have the right to choose a service animal that are comfortable with.* There is no logical connection between the two sentences; hence the referent “this” is unclear and the audience is confused about the relationship between the ideas.

The conclusion begins by addressing the opposing point of view; this is not required at this grade level but it is an effective way of transitioning to a conclusion. The overall sense of completeness further validates a score that enters the 3 category for organization and purpose.



**Response**

A new law has been made stating that service dogs and not other service animals are allowed in public places. I agree with this law, and in this article, I will be explaining why I say this.

In public places, there are more people than just you there. So if you bring in a service monkey or snake, it could hurt someone. No one knows what the animal could do next. But with dogs, which we've lived with for hundreds of years, are less likely to hurt someone.

Also, service animals could transmit diseases to some other people. And service birds could leave behind droppings on the ground, which makes for an unhealthy environment.

People who run business like the idea of the law. The dogs don't bark during shows, they sit quietly at a lunch meeting, and they listen to commands. Imagine walking to work with a service goat leading you there! Too noisy!

Overall, I think this law is a good choice to make. Other service animals are still allowed in your house or other private places, so don't be too bummed out if you love your service pig or something. I hope you understand my opinion, and I'll see you again in the next newspaper. Adios!

Info from: Source #3

**3****SCORE POINT**

This response presents a clear opinion and provides the reader with the context for the issue of service animals. The concluding paragraph does more than restate the opinion, effectively offering “solace” to those who oppose the law. The supporting ideas are text-based but fairly general and somewhat randomly selected; hence the progression of ideas is just adequate. Transitions are used but because of the loose connections between and among supports, they don’t clarify relationships well (the focus of paragraph 3 could be tighter, and paragraph 4 uses text information about the benefits of dogs but then jumps to goats without explicitly connecting the two). Overall, the positive elements of the introduction and conclusion are strong enough to justify a score of 3 for this response.

**Response****The New Service Animal Law**

Do you like the new law that only permits service dogs and not other service animals in public? Well if you are not sure this article can help you decide if you like the law or not. I personally think it is good but at the same time bad. There are two sides of this law; the good and the bad.

The good is that the the men and women who passed the law are right, big service animals can wreck things that are flimsy and fragile and make too much noise in places that are meant to be quiet. Also animals such as snakes and monkeys or more can pass dangerous diseases. This new law enforces service animals besides dogs to remain in the disabled person's home and to be not seen in public.

Then there is the bad side. A disabled person who does not have a service dog but does have a service monkey can not go to a restaurant or even go out to any place except for their front or back yard. The only way they could go out is if they have someone who is staying with them or a friend. What if a disabled person goes out to a restaurant and has snake for a helper who is under control and never does anything bad? They might try explaining to the workers that their snake should be able to stay because it is under control; but the workers would just say no, no, and no. It would not be fair to them because it is like they have no rights.

Il n conclusion, I think the law should change to permit service dogs and monkeys but the monkeys have to be checked that they have no disease before they go out.

4

## SCORE POINT

This well-organized response introduces the topic with a rhetorical question and then gives the reader a motive to read further (...*this article can help you decide...*). There is a clear organizational plan, which is followed throughout: presentation of pros and cons. The writer uses deductive reasoning, coming to the clear, qualified opinion on the new law in the conclusion (expand the law to include pre-screened and trained monkeys). While this is an unusual strategy for a 5<sup>th</sup> grade writer, it is effective.

There is some minor repetition (the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> sentences in the introduction are repetitive), and paragraph 3 has some unclear referents that mildly interrupt the flow (...*but the workers would just say no, no, and no. It would not be fair to them because it is like they have no rights.*). Overall, however, the writer crafts a convincing opinion article for the audience, moving the response into the 4 scoring category.

**Response**

Service animals are great. They help disabled people get around, do everyday tasks that they couldn't normally do, and just provide comfort! But a law has been passed blocking any service animal except dogs to be in public places. Is this a good thing? Other service animals can do things dogs can't, provide comfort some dogs can't, but aren't allowed in public anymore.

Dogs can carry backpacks, fetch things, and other tasks. But they do not have the abilities of other service animals. For example, monkeys can grasp straws and hold forks. Imagine how this would be helpful if you had no arms or couldn't use them. They can open CD players, change TV channels, and turn lights on and off. Most dogs can not do those things. And only dogs are allowed in public spaces.

While service dogs are loving and loyal, they also happen to be on the large side. They might be too big to get in a car or on a bus. Monkeys are small, can ride on your shoulder, and usually aren't troublesome. People overuse the excuse of service animals carrying diseases. Like a normal pet, they have been checked for disease. Dogs do carry less chance of disease, but they can have fleas.

Dogs do have their upside. Dogs have been pets of humans for hundreds of years. They are calm, familiar, and helpful. Many people are comfortable around dogs. If a service dog walked into a cafe, no one would make a fuss. But if someone walked in with a snake, others might get nervous or feel uncomfortable.

My opinion of this new law is that I think it is too limiting. Some disabled people need help that a dog can not provide. And if they can't get the help they need in public places, then they have to have another person to help them, or stay at home. This takes their freedom away from them. It doesn't seem fair that only dogs are allowed in public. Other service animals can do things dogs can't, provide comfort when dogs can't, but aren't allowed in public.

## SCORE POINT

4

The response clearly communicates an opinion about the service animal law, and that focus is consistently maintained. The introduction is effective in appealing to an audience, clearly explaining the law in question, and posing a question about the worth of the law. Transitions are appropriate (*but* and *For example*) and occasionally subtle (The final sentence in paragraph 2 nicely segues to the next paragraph: *And [yet] only dogs are allowed in public spaces*). The conclusion begins with a strong opinion statement and subtly summarizes the argument while providing a generalization about the importance of the argument (*This takes their freedom away from them*). It can be argued that paragraph 4, which acknowledges the opposing point of view, does not clearly support the opinion; however, addressing the opposition is not required at this grade level, and the information presented is relevant and does not detract from the logical progression of ideas.

# EVIDENCE/ELABORATION



**Response**

There is a new law where people can't have any other animals exept dogs. My oppinion this is ok I feel having animals unsupervised at any time is very wrong dogs are very tammed animals who behave very aproputly I feel other animals aren't taimmed and well behaved and you really don't want to take a cat out or other animals, because they are not animals who belong in those tipe of places. I feel that the new law is appropriate for this tipe of situation.

**SCORE POINT****1**

Although it is clear the writer is responding to the task and has absorbed at least some of the source material, the response provides no specific support from these materials. The minimal elaboration (via attempted explanation) is vague and inadequate for the audience and purpose (...*you really don't want to take a cat out or other animals, because they are not animals who belong in those tipe of places.*). The vocabulary is general and repetitive, showing little awareness of style or audience's needs.



## Response

**I think that other animals should be aloud in public.**

I think that other animals should be aloud in public because they can be helpful in handing people things and being freindly like it is writenin the following passeges.

In the first passege it is writin that a monkey helps a man in a whilechair by handing him cool drinks,playing a CD and turning the lights on and of.

In the second passage their was a girl that needed help swimming. So a group of dolphins helped her swim. And that is why **I think that other animals should be aloud in public.**

## SCORE POINT

1

The response provides minimal evidence for the stated opinion (*I think that other animals should be aloud in public*). While the response does attribute information to specific sources, there is virtually no development of these ideas. For example, paragraph 2 relies solely on a brief summary of the help offered by capuchin monkeys as a means of elaboration. In paragraph 3, the reference to source #2 is irrelevant as used (dolphins are not service animals as defined in the law); furthermore, the information is inaccurately summarized (the girl did not need help swimming). There is insufficient elaboration to warrant any score higher than a 1.

**Response**

I think that the new law is necessary because lets say if you have a snake as a seeing eye pet and you and the snake walk into a restaurant. An old lady sees the snake and screams not knowing that its a seeing eye pet causing other people to turn their heads around and scream too. Now everyone leaves the restaurant and the restaurant might go out of business Or another example is that you walk into a hotel with your seeing eye pet, a monkey. All the sudden the monkey goes mad for who knows what reason because monkeys do that. The monkey runs around the hotel and wrecks a bunch of expensive things that now you have to pay for. A dog for instance is more predictable and more easy to handle. Also animals like that might spread disease.

The new law is good because it keeps other people and the seeing eye pet's owner safe. Even though another animal may be more fun I would rather be safe then sorry.

**SCORE POINT****2**

Despite some misinterpretations of source materials (snakes do not assist the blind), this response demonstrates some cursory use of elaborative techniques. For example, the writer attempts to show the effect on patrons of having a snake in a restaurant and the possible destruction caused by a wild monkey – elaboration via cause and effect. While the development is not particularly helpful, it shows an emerging understanding of the need to develop ideas. The response also draws a generalization from the specific examples presented (safety for pet's owner and other people), again showing an emerging understanding of an audience's needs. The token use of available source material and the somewhat inappropriate style for a formal writing occasion confirm a score of 2 for evidence and elaboration.

**Response****The Law**

By: Sidney

In this opinion article, I will be telling you my opinion about the service animal law that was made in 2011. It states that only service dogs can be used as pets in public places. I think it should be different because of many reasons. Here are some of them.

I think that the law should be changed because people with disabilities should be able to choose what service animal they take into public places with them. I also think that the service animals need to be checked by a veterinarian to make sure that the animal doesn't carry a disease around in public places. I think this because people with disabilities should have the right to choose a service animal they are comfortable with. Here are some of the reasons people might want different service animals.

Some service animals can perform more complicated tasks than others. Most people choose their service animal, so that they can be comfortable with it. For example, a service can't get their master a drink, like a monkey can. Service animals have many tasks that they help their master accomplish. For example, they help with everyday tasks, or they just comfort their master. Some people choose lizards, snakes, pigs, birds, cats, monkeys, and dogs as their comforting service animals.

I understand the fact that people don't want animals with diseases in public places, but the owner needs to be comfortable with their service animal. That's why the law should be like it was before it was changed in 2011.

## SCORE POINT

2

While this response incorporates a range of text evidence, overall the integration is too weak to earn a score higher than a 2. The style is generally appropriate although some lapses detract from the overall effectiveness of the piece. For example, paragraph 2 uses repetitive language (*I think that, I also think that, I think this because*) that actually confounds the logic of the argument. For example, in paragraph 2, the response states *...people with disabilities should be able to choose...; yet 2 sentences later, I think this because people with disabilities should have the right to choose... is used as a support for the previous claim. Similarly, repetition of words and ideas such as comfortable interferes with the development of the ideas. On the other hand, the opposing point of view is acknowledged and addressed (...service animals need to be checked by a veterinarian.... and I understand the fact that people don't want animals with diseases in public places....), which is not required till grade 7, and thus shows an emerging awareness of the argumentative purpose.*

**Response**

A new law has been made stating that service dogs and not other service animals are allowed in public places. I agree with this law, and in this article, I will be explaining why I say this.

In public places, there are more people than just you there. So if you bring in a service monkey or snake, it could hurt someone. No one knows what the animal could do next. But with dogs, which we've lived with for hundreds of years, are less likely to hurt someone.

Also, service animals could transmit diseases to some other people. And service birds could leave behind droppings on the ground, which makes for an unhealthy environment.

People who run business like the idea of the law. The dogs don't bark during shows, they sit quietly at a lunch meeting, and they listen to commands. Imagine walking to work with a service goat leading you there! Too noisy!

Overall, I think this law is a good choice to make. Other service animals are still allowed in your house or other private places, so don't be too bummed out if you love your service pig or something. I hope you understand my opinion, and I'll see you again in the next newspaper. Adios!

Info from: Source #3

## 3

## SCORE POINT

This response contains evidence from the source material that is generally integrated and relevant. The response demonstrates an adequate use of some elaborative techniques. For example, logical cause and effect is used to elaborate the supporting details in paragraph 2, which begins with a generalization (*In public places, there are more people than just you there. So if you bring in a service monkey or snake, it could hurt someone. No one knows what the animal could do next. But with dogs, which we've lived with for hundreds of years, are less likely to hurt someone*). Although not required at this grade level, the acknowledging the opposing opinion is also used for support (*Other service animals are still allowed in your house or other private places, so don't be too bummed out if you love your service pig or something*). Vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose, creating a generally engaging style (*Imagine walking to work with a service goat leading you there! Too Noisy!*). There are places where the “paraphrasing” is very close to copying (for example: original source states, “Birds could leave droppings on a store floor. This creates an unhealthy setting for others.” The response version: *And service birds could leave behind droppings on the ground, which makes for an unhealthy environment*), but overall the development is sufficient for a score point of 3.



## Response

**Service Animals Limited to Dog's in Public Areas**

In our country a new law has been passed that only dog's can be allowed in public areas. I disagree with this law because many animals other than dog's can be a life saver to people with disabilities. Like the capuchin monkey; a highly educational monkey whom can perform activities that an everyday human would do.

The animals in our country that are helping people today are highly trained. For example, a horse who can sense the direction the human wants to walk just by the position of their knees. No car can do that! Also, a snake that can grab things off the shelf in the grocery store if you are blind. And a monkey that can open a refrigerator, help you drink out of a straw, and read. Nearly impossible. But Animal expert at Helping Hands Christina says that they monkeys have to do the same things the experts do. Also, expert Jennifer trains the monkeys to know the objects and be able to open other things.

But people from our state's government also have some compelling reasons. The government states that the animals could spread diseases that could harm other humans like a bird's droppings on the floor could spread diseases to the passing humans. Another reason is that the animals could spread sudden fierceness to the other people around him that could hurt and possibly be fatal. But the animals could save more lives than they could harm. For example, a capuchin monkey saved over 10 people's life in a hospital when a fire started and the monkey led the nurses out of the building. No lives were lost because of the monkey and he won an award by the local police department.

In conclusion, the law that was passed was quite insensible because other animals will do the same job and maybe more than a dog could do even with proper training.

**SCORE POINT****3**

This response provides support for the opinion that includes the use of a range of source materials\* and adequate elaboration of those ideas. Adequate evidence from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet general (*Also, expert Jennifer trains the monkeys to know the objects and be able to open other things*). The response demonstrates adequate use of elaborative techniques including examples (*... a capuchin monkey saved over 10 peoples life in a hospital when a fire started and the monkey led the nurses out of the building*). The vocabulary and style are generally appropriate for the audience and purpose (*But people from our state's goverment also have some compelling reason's*).

\*In the Pilot Test, source #1 was a video. Although not attributed to that video source, some references/quotations come from that earlier source, not the article "Monkey Helpers," which is source #1 on the updated Practice Test.



**Response**

Is the New Law Fair?

Would you stand against an unfair law? My opinion on the new law about only letting service dogs to go with their owner in public places would have to be that I think we should let any kind of animal in a public place that helps people with disabilities. My reasons are that we should respect people's choices, know that if the animal can't go in neither can the person, and remember that they have payed a lot of money for this animal.

My first reason for letting any service animal in a public building is that we should respect people's choices and not judge them by what animal they think is best. Some people like dogs, monkeys, pigs, birds, cats or even a lizard! These animals are all great and I would choose any of them for a guide. Monkeys can even help someone drink out of a straw or play a CD! That is amazing!! Although dogs are the most common service animal all of them are just as great and I think having a different animal as a guide would be fun! From monkeys to pigs what will be next?? A frog???

The second reason is that we need to keep in mind if the animal isn't allowed to go in neither is the person. Now that they have banned all service animals except for dogs in public places the human can't go in because they need their animal to see! This is not fair and we need to let everyone know that even though you may not want the animal in the store the person is now not able to go in because it needs its service animal to get around.

My last reason is that we need to remember that these people have payed a lot of money for these animals. Now the animals are not doing their jobs. Since they can't go to any places the people have payed their money and can't even have their service animals take them to the places they might need to go to. This is a big waste of money for some people. I think we need to stand up and allow the animals to go into each store no matter what.

This law is not fair to all the disabled people. I know if I was disabled I would protest and hopefully get my rights to go into the stores. The 3 reasons are that we should respect people's choices, know that if the animal is banned from the store the person can't go in either, and remember that their animal was a lot of money. Hopefully these 3 reasons will start to get people wondering about the new law. I feel strongly about my opinion and I hope other people will too.

## SCORE POINT

4

This writer effectively supports the opinion, using purposeful scenarios as examples followed by drawing logical generalizations about the effects of these scenarios (e.g., paying money [to train animals] and then being unable to use them for their intended purpose - a waste of money). The style, however, is uneven: the response begins with an effective rhetorical question (Would you stand for an unfair law?), but later uses a somewhat inappropriate question/answer (what will be next?? A frog???) to develop an idea. The language is similarly uneven, ranging from distracting phrases such as my reasons (first, second, last) to a more mature recycling of stand against (in the introduction) and stand up and allow (in the final body paragraph). Despite these flaws, the overall development of text-based ideas helps move this response into the 4 scoring category for evidence and elaboration.

Grade 5  
Evidence and Elaboration  
Sample 4-Point

Anchor Response #8

## Response

Pets are fun, loving, and especially playful. They lick you when your sad and play with you when you are cheerful. But did you ever think that your pets could help people with disabilities complete their daily routines? We only know so much of the intelligence of animals and we can help uncover the mystery by training them to help people! But some people feel inclined to bring there service pets into public places. Which makes sense, but you have to draw the line somewhere. Just like the law states people should not be allowed to bring their service pets into public places unless it is a dog.

There are many animals on our planet, but there aren't many that are known as man's best friend. The dog however is a species that has been a pet to humans for hundreds of years. They are obedient when trained well, if potty trained these animals won't detroy the atmosphere of a public place with something unpleasant, and they can be silent if told to firmly enough. Furthermore these animals are very intelligent and thy have successfully been used to help people for many years. Although nimble, the monkey has a habit of changing moods fast and frequently. In addition they can hurt a person. Birds are to noisy. But the dog is capable of being in public.

When thinking about this law you also have to think about the well being of the cafe or store or any other place you bring your service pet. If you bring a bird into a building and they use the floor as a bathroom, then the other guest in the area become digusted and might not decide to come back. This means that the business would lose money. Furthermore they have a mess on the floor that needs to be delt with. If your service pet is a monkey and you are riding a bus, the monkey may change moods and harm the person sitting next to you. It is important to think about the people around you and what they think of your pet and their actions. Lets face it, not many people agree to the idea of bringing a pig into the toy store.

Many people may disagree to the law but you have to realize that a person who has a strange service learning pet isn't the only person in a public place. There other people who are there to enjoy their day. You may think that the people with disabilities deserve to have any animal they like. Although, there are many solutions to this law. You can have an additional service pet that is a dog. Dogs are wonderful creatures so you can't really make a mistake of switching to another animal or having two.

Hopefully by now you have seen the importance of the law. Dogs are amazing and can be trusted in public. Other animals might be disruptive to an environment or harm people. You can get a dog to be your service pet so you are able to bring him/her in public. It is so important to think about the other people in our world, and the well being of businesses

4

SCORE POINT

This response shows effective and logical development of text-based information. The support is based on accurate information from the text, and each text detail is developed using an effective elaborative techniques. For example, in paragraph 3 the response shows the use of logical cause and effect that goes beyond summary ([customers disgusted by an animal's mess] *might not decide to come back. This means that the business would lose money*). The writer then continues with an effective generalization based on the evidence (*It is important to think about the people around you and what they think of your pet and their actions*). Although not required at this grade level, the writer elaborates in paragraph 4 by addressing the opposing point of view (*You may think that the people with disabilities deserve to have any animal they like. Although, there are many solutions to this law. You can have an additional service pet that is a dog*). Although the response relies heavily on source #3 for support, other sources are also referenced. (Note: this response comes from the 2013 Pilot Test, which did not specifically tell students to use more than one source, nor did it direct students to clearly attribute or cite sources). Precise language effectively paraphrases the source material throughout (*Although nimble, the monkey has a habit of changing moods fast and frequently*). Overall, the writer uses effective and purposeful scenarios as examples to illustrate and clarify ideas, crafting a convincing opinion article for the audience.

# CONVENTION



**Note:** The conventions anchor set is composed of samples from several different grade 5 Performance Tasks. The analysis of grade-specific conventions, however, is not purpose-specific; therefore, teachers can use the following anchors regardless of task.

Anchor Response #1

Response

Monkeys that open refrigerators, you might think its not possible but it is. Monkeys are bieng trained at helping hands.

The first stage to training is the qubicle where they are taught monkey see monkey do were they copy the trainers actions and when they ding the bell the monkeys know they got the task correct

Stage number two is the b-room were the monkey is intrduced to the cage and the wheel chair and learns how to put a drink in a drink holder, how to put cd's in a cd player, how to work refrigerators, and learn more advanced tasks.

The final stage is the apartment. where the monkeys learn to open food containers, and scratching itces on people

After completing training a monkey gos through a placement prossess to find the right home and the right person.

Monkeys are intelegent creatures.

0

SCORE POINT

This response does not demonstrate a command of grade-appropriate conventions -

- There are many **punctuation** errors. There are errors with comma use including a missing comma after introductory elements (...*when they ding the bell the monkeys know....*) and an unnecessary comma in a compound predicate (...*monkeys learn to open food containers, and scratching...\**); Other punctuation errors include errors with an apostrophes to form a contraction (*its*) and a possessive (*trainers actions*). Finally, there are errors with end marks (final sentences in paragraph 2 and 4 are missing periods).
- There are **sentence formation** errors including incorrect use of punctuation creating a comma-splice in the first sentence and a sentence fragment in paragraph 4 (*where the monkeys learn to open food containers, and scratching itces on people*).
- There are relatively frequent **misspellings** of grade-appropriate words ( *bieng, tough, itces, gos*).
- There are **capitalization** errors with missing capitals for proper nouns (*helping hands*).
- There are relatively few grade-appropriate **grammar-usage** errors with some misuse of frequently confused words (*were* instead of *where* and *its* instead of *it's*).

Overall, the high density of errors keeps this response at the 0 level for conventions.

\*Note, the lack of parallelism is not an error for this grade level

**Response**

Skates and rays are unusial fish because their fins steach from their side of their head to the end of their bodys. Inmagen your arms being as long as you. They live near the ocean floor or on the ocean floor. They are flat not like other fish. Other fish are round with fins that are sepret on their bodys.

The first reson skates and rays are unusial fish because of their fetures. For example their color blends in with the sand but ather fish have different colors to macth the colorful corl reef. Their shape is like a dimond and normal fish have a round shape. Their fins are different from other fish because skates and rays fins streach from their sides of their head to the end of their body. They are like sharks. They have the same kind of bones.( Their bones are cartilage it is tissue found in your ears and nose.)

The secound reason skates and rays are unusial fish because how they live. You would think fish live in open waters. But not skates and rays! They skim the ocean floor or they are on the ocean floor. Rays burry themselves under the sand and mud on the floor. Skates just lie on the ocean floor or move slowly on the floor looking for food.

The third reason skates and rays are unusial fish because of what they eat. Skates and rays are carnivors. They mostly eat hard-shelled snails. Or what they do catch their prey. Rays hide under the mud and sand and wait for their food to come to them. They trap their prey against the ocean floor with their bodys. Then the use their flat hard teeth to crush the hard shells.



The fourth reason skates and rays are unusial fish because how they difend them selves. They are ususally peaceful creatures.

SCORE POINT

0

This response demonstrates little command of conventions -

- There are severe errors in **sentence formation** including fused sentences in the second and fifth paragraphs (*Their bones are cartilage it is tissue found in your ears and nose and Their many different kinds of rays and skates they have many different ways to diffend them selves*) and sentence fragments in most paragraphs (*The first reson skates and rays are unusual fish because of their fetures; Or what they do catch their prey*).
- There are **punctuation** errors including a missing apostrophe to form a possessive noun (*rays fins*) and missing commas after an introductory phrase and in compound sentences.
- There is an error with **capitalization** (incorrectly capitalizing *Can* in the final paragraph).
- There is a **grammar usage** errors in the final paragraph confusing *Their* and *There* are.
- The incorrect **spelling** of basic grade-appropriate spelling words is so pervasive that a fluent reading of the response is very difficult (*unusial, steach, reson, secound, etc.*).

While this response is lengthy, the proportion of errors to the amount of writing done well is significant, and the errors are severe enough to interfere with understanding which confirms the score of 0.

## Baseline Anchor Response #3

## Response

The new law for service animals, in my opinion is a good law because some animals like snakes, lizards and even horses may be too dangerous or too large. I think it was a good choice because if they bring monkeys and birds, they might spread diseases and other infections to public stores like McDonalds or Burger King. I say that animals like birds of any kind need to stay outside of public stores because they leave droppings. And when you have a service dog it won't hurt you. A service dog also could hold its poop and it won't poop on the floor. And people are used to being around dogs because a dog is man's best friend.

I also think the law change was a good one because the people who work at the hotel have to deal with horses and goats! I'm not the only one who agrees with the law change, people who run businesses were pleased. Most animals carried stuff to get a man sick. My opinion is that monkeys can get mad in a flash and start throwing punches at someone, that's mainly why they made the law in the first place. I think that dogs are safer because not many people have allergies to dogs.

Finally, my last opinions are that some service animals are not safe because they have snakes, lizards and monkeys that hit really hard. Also, snakes might lose control and bite somebody.

Also, many animals can scare children in public places. But children, like I said earlier, love dogs. Finally, my opinion is that service dogs are really safer than other dogs and they can protect their owner.

## SCORE POINT

1

This response demonstrates a partial command of conventions -

- There is limited use of correct **punctuation** including missing apostrophes in contractions (*Im, wont, thats*) and in possessive nouns (*mans*). There are missing commas before a coordinating conjunction in a compound sentence (final paragraph) and after introductory elements (*And when you have a service dog it....*].
- There are some **grammar usage** errors including basic subject/verb agreement (*...not the only one who agree with the law*), and errors with frequently confused words (*won* instead of *one*, *loose* instead of *lose*, *to* instead of *too*). Minor inconsistencies or shifts with verb tense (between sentence 1 and 2) are not significant. There are two comma splices in paragraph 2 although neither interferes with meaning.
- There are a few errors with grade-appropriate **spelling** (*deceases, arond, businesses*).
- The use of **capitalization** is adequate (*king* should be *King*).

Overall, there are a variety of grade-specific errors, especially with punctuation and grammar-usage. However, the response is lengthy so the lower density of errors indicates a partial command of conventions (score point 1).

**Response**

Once there was a circus clown and he was not just any circus clown, He was the the GREAT AND MIGHTY circus clown. He was the only clown treated that way and all the other clowns felt like nothing. But one day all of that changed. the GREAT AND MIGHTY had passed, his day's were over. But all the clowns were very happy! But then Mr. Henndersmocks (the king) came to talk to Orangey (the clown) about what happend...

The next day was a day of regret. Mr. Henndersmocks didn't know for sure but he thought that he was pretty sure that Orangey and his little clown gang did it. Murdered the GREAT AND MIGHTY!!!! "No sir." said Rue. (the other clown) " why do you think we did it?" said pinky." I know you did it." said Mr. henndersmock. "BUT WE DIDN'T MURDER THE GREAT AND MIGHTY!!!!!" said rue. Okay! Okay! you didn't do it then. But who did?!

"We don't know?" said Orangey. "Well, you guys better find out who did or I'll still tink it's you guys." Okay?" Can you do that for me?" I guess. Okay! we'll do it sir. well let's put Bluey in charge of cleaning up the messes and... NO! said Bluey. I'm always cleaning up for you guys. I want a real job this time Orangey. Okay Bluey! you can be the cubbose. FINE said Bluey. Rolling his eyes. Pinky, your the cleaner this time. Okay? Why can't you ever be the cleaner. YOU never have been that job yet Orangey?! Okay... says Orangey. Pinky your in charge of leading the line and greeny your cleaning with me. Okay? "OKAY!"

Okay everbody here? Pinky, Orangey, Greeny and bluey?! GOOD! Everyone's here. AHHHHHHHH!!!!!! Oh No! what happend Pinky? That mean man hit me and he's right there! GET HIM!!!!!! CHARRRRGGGGEEEE. Got him! good job Bluey. What's wrong with you? REDDY?! Where have you been? we've been looking everywhere

for you. Your the murderer of the GREAT AND MIGHTY?! Yes. wow. I wasn't expecting that either. Ha ha!!! Let's go home now. YEAH! I'm tired too. Okay let's go home. HA HA HA HA!!! THE END!?

Sorry that this is so short!

Sinsereely: Macie

**SCORE POINT****1**

This response demonstrates a partial command of conventions -

- There is limited use of correct **punctuation**. There are missing commas to indicate direct address (*Pinky your in charge*) and a period instead of a comma within dialogue (*"No sir." said Rue*). In addition, the use of quotation marks to mark direct speech is inconsistent.
- There is inconsistent **capitalization** of proper names (*bluey, greeny*) and failure to capitalize the first word in many sentences.
- There are errors with **sentence formation**, including a comma splice and a fragment.
- Basic **spelling** and **grammar usage** are adequate.

Overall, the response demonstrates a limited control of grade-appropriate conventions, confirming a score of 1.

**Response**

Pets are fun, loving, and especially playful. They lick you when your sad and play with you when you are cheerful. But did you ever think that your pets could help people with disabilities complete their daily routines? We only know so much of the intelligence of animals and we can help uncover the mystery by training them to help people! But some people feel inclined to bring there service pets into public places. Which makes sense, but you have to draw the line somewhere. Just like the law states people should not be allowed to bring their service pets into public places unless it is a dog.

There are many animals on our planet, but there aren't many that are known as man's best friend. The dog however is a species that has been a pet to humans for hundreds of years. They are obedient when trained well, if potty trained these animals won't detroy the atmosphere of a public place with something unpleasant, and they can be silent if told to firmly enough. Furthermore these animals are very intelligent and thy have successfully been used to help people for many years. Although nimble, the monkey has a habit of changing moods fast and frequently. In addition they can hurt a person. Birds are to noisy. But the dog is capable of being in public.

When thinking about this law you also have to think about the well being of the cafe or store or any other place you bring your service pet. If you bring a bird into a building and they use the floor as a bathroom, then the other guest in the area become digusted and might not decide to come back. This means that the business would lose money. Furthermore they have a mess on the floor that needs to be delt with. If your service pet is a monkey and you are riding a bus, the monkey may change moods and harm the person sitting next to you. It is important to think about the people around you and what they think of your pet and their actions. Lets face it, not many people agree to the idea of bringing a pig into the toy store.

Many people may disagree to the law but you have to realize that a person who has a strange service learning pet isn't the only person in a public place. There other people who are there to enjoy their day. You may think that the people with disabilities deserve to have any animal they like. Although, there are many solutions to this law. You can have an additional service pet that is a dog. Dogs are wonderful creatures so you can't really make a mistake of switching to another animal or having two.

Hopefully by now you have seen the importance of the law. Dogs are amazing and can be trusted in public. Other animals might be disruptive to an enviormnt or harm people. You can get a dog to be your service pet so you are able to bring him/her in public. It is so important to think about the other people in our world, and the well being of businesses

## SCORE POINT

## 2

The writing demonstrates an adequate command of conventions -

- There are a few errors with grade-appropriate **spelling** words (*detroy, digusted, delt, Although*).
- There are some grade-specific errors with **grammar usage** including a subject/verb agreement error (*...the other guest in the area become...*) and errors with frequently confused words (*your* instead of *you're*; *there* instead of *their*; *to* instead of *too*).
- There are some **sentence formation** errors including a comma splice in the second paragraph and a sentence fragment in the fourth paragraph.
- The greatest numbers of errors for this response fall in the **punctuation** category. There are missing commas after introductory elements (*When thinking about this law you also..., Furthermore..., and In addition...*), missing commas in compound sentences (*Many people may disagree to the law but you have to..., and Dogs are wonderful creatures so you can't really...*), and an unnecessary comma with compound predicate (final sentence in the response). There is also a missing apostrophe (*Lets*) and missing period (final sentence in the response).

While the response contains a variety of error types, comparing the overall length of this complex response with the number of errors shows an adequate command of conventions.



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

Score	4	3	2	1	NS
<b>Organization/Purpose</b>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>opinion is introduced, clearly communicated, and the focus is strongly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li>consistent use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>effective introduction and conclusion</li> <li>logical progression of ideas from beginning to end; strong connections between and among ideas with some syntactic variety</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>opinion is clear, and the focus is mostly maintained for the purpose and audience</li> <li>adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety to clarify relationships between and among ideas</li> <li>adequate introduction and conclusion</li> <li>adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end; adequate connections between and among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>opinion may be somewhat unclear, or the focus may be insufficiently sustained for the purpose and/or audience</li> <li>inconsistent use of transitional strategies and/or little variety</li> <li>introduction or conclusion, if present, may be weak</li> <li>uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end; and/or formulaic; inconsistent or unclear connections between and among ideas</li> </ul>	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the opinion but may provide little or no focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>opinion may be confusing or ambiguous; response may be too brief or the focus may drift from the purpose and/or audience</li> <li>few or no transitional strategies are evident</li> <li>introduction and/or conclusion may be missing</li> <li>frequent extraneous ideas may be evident; ideas may be randomly ordered or have an unclear progression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>



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

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

\*Elaborative techniques may include the use of personal experiences that support the opinion.

2-Point Opinion Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 3–5)				
Score	2	1	0	NS
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<p>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient (includes copied text)</li> <li>In a language other than English</li> <li>Off-topic</li> <li>Off-purpose</li> </ul>

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.