

Claim 4: Students can engage in research/inquiry to investigate topics, and to analyze, integrate, and present information.

Claim 2: Students can produce effective writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

Claim 4

Target 2, ANALYZE/INTEGRATE INFORMATION: Analyze information within and among sources of information (print and non-print texts, data sets, conducting procedures, etc.).

Target 3, EVALUATE INFORMATION/SOURCES: Use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility and accuracy of each source in order to gather and select information to support analysis, reflection, and research.

Target 4, USE EVIDENCE: Cite evidence to support arguments, ideas, or analyses.

Claim 2

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.

Clarifications

- Performance Task (PT): In general, the PT should allow students to demonstrate deeper thinking and allow more integration of information from resources. Sources should cover the subject sufficiently enough to allow students to form a claim, but not be too general.
- Choosing Sources: Overall, the sources should offer more factual information and citations than just unsupported opinions. In general, although there might be some exceptions, stories or other works of fiction are generally not appropriate for these research tasks.
- Each performance task (PT) should be as unique as possible. Within a PT set, stimuli may, however, be used in more than one PT if necessary and important to the task. This must be done cautiously and to a limited extent only. There should be different companion stimuli and, in addition, the two PTs must not have the same focus.
- The set of sources should support both sides of an issue. The set of sources should be somewhat balanced so a particular position is not privileged; the sources should allow for students to support different positions.
- Choose sources with writing assignment in mind. Think about writing assignment and whether sources provide enough information for an appropriate argumentative full write. Try not to create a writing assignment around a set of sources – the writing purpose **should come from the sources** and not be a forced fit.
- Claim 4 Targets: Target 2 will assess analyzing information within and among texts for research purposes as well as paraphrasing and avoiding plagiarism for the purpose of integrating information. Target 3 will assess evaluating a list of sources for accuracy and credibility. Target 4 will assess selecting evidence to support arguments, ideas, or analyses.
- Research Questions: The three research questions must represent at least two different Claim 4 targets. Within a PT set, an item task model for a research question can be used across PTs.

Claim 4 Target 2

ANALYZE/INTEGRATE INFORMATION: Analyze information within and among sources of information (print and non-print texts, data sets, conducting procedures, etc.).

Gr. 6 Standards: RI-1, RI-6, RI-8, RI-9, RH-1, RH-2, RH-7, RH-8, RH-9, RST-1, RST-2, RST-7, RST-8, RST-9, W-8, W-9, WHST-8, WHST-9

(PT: DOK 3 if machine-scored; DOK 4 if short-text items)

6.RI-1 Cite textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.

6.RI-6 Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and explain how it is conveyed in the text.

6.RI-8 Trace and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, distinguishing claims that are supported by reasons and evidence from claims that are not.

6.RI-9 Compare and contrast one author’s presentation of events with that of another (e.g., a memoir written by and a biography on the same person).

6.RH-1 Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources.

6.RST-1 Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of science and technical texts.

6.RH-2 Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.

6.RST-2 Determine the central ideas or conclusions of a text; provide an accurate summary of the text distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.

6.RH-7 Integrate visual information (e.g., in charts, graphs, photographs, videos, or maps) with other information in print and digital texts.

6.RST-7 Integrate quantitative or technical information expressed in words in a text with a version of that information expressed visually (e.g., in a flowchart, diagram, model, graph, or table).

6.RH-8 Distinguish among fact, opinion, and reasoned judgment in a text.

6.RST-8 Distinguish among facts, reasoned judgment based on research findings, and speculation in a text.

6.RST-9 Compare and contrast the information gained from experiments, simulations, video or multimedia sources

	<p><u>with that gained from reading a text on the same topic.</u></p> <p>6.W-8 <u>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</u> and providing basic bibliographic information for sources.</p> <p>6.WHST-8 <u>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</u> and following a standard format for citation.</p> <p>6.W-9 <u>Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</u></p> <p>6.WHST-9 <u>Draw evidence from informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</u></p> <p>Claim 4 Target 3 EVALUATE INFORMATION/SOURCES: Use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility and accuracy of each source in order to gather and select information to support analysis, reflection, and research. Gr. 6 Standards: W-8, WHST-8 (PT: DOK 3 if machine-scored; DOK 4 if short-text items)</p> <p>6.W-8 <u>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.</u></p> <p>6.W WHST-8 <u>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.</u></p> <p>Claim 4 Target 4 USE EVIDENCE: Cite evidence to support arguments, ideas or analyses. Gr. 6 Standards: RI-9, RH-1, RH-7, RH-8, RH-9, RST-1, RST-7, RST-8, RST-9, W-1b, W-8, W-9, WHST-8, WHST-9 (PT: DOK 3 if machine-scored; DOK 4 if short-text items)</p> <p>6.RI-9 <u>Compare and contrast one author's presentation of events with that of another (e.g., a memoir written by and a biography on the same person).</u></p> <p>6.RH-1 <u>Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources.</u></p> <p>6.RST-1 <u>Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of science and technical texts.</u></p> <p>6.RH-7 <u>Integrate visual information (e.g., in charts, graphs, photographs, videos, or maps) with other</u></p>
--	--

	<p><u>information in print and digital texts.</u></p> <p>6.RST-7 <u>Integrate quantitative or technical information expressed in words in a text with a version of that information expressed visually (e.g., in a flowchart, diagram, model, graph, or table).</u></p> <p>6.RH-8 <u>Distinguish among fact, opinion, and reasoned judgment in a text.</u></p> <p>6.RST-8 <u>Distinguish among facts, reasoned judgment based on research findings, and speculation in a text.</u></p> <p>6.RH-9 <u>Analyze the relationship between a primary and secondary source on the same topic.</u></p> <p>6.RST-9 <u>Compare and contrast the information gained from experiments, simulations, video or multimedia sources with that gained from reading a text on the same topic.</u></p> <p>6.W-1b <u>Support claim(s) with clear reasons and relevant evidence, using credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.</u></p> <p>6.W-8 <u>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.</u></p> <p>6.WHST-8 <u>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.</u></p> <p>6.W-9 <u>Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</u></p> <p>6.WHST-9 <u>Draw evidence from informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</u></p> <p>Claim 2 Target 7</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Gr. 6 Standards: W-1a, W-1b, W-1c, W-1d, W-1e, W-4, W-5, W-8, and W-9, WHST-1,4,5,8,9 (DOK 4)</p> <p>6.W-1, WHST-1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Introduce claim(s) and organize the reasons and evidence clearly.</u> b. <u>Support claim(s) with clear reasons and relevant evidence, using credible sources and demonstrating</u>
--	---

	<p><u>an understanding of the topic or text.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Use words, phrases, and clauses to clarify the relationships among claim(s) and reasons.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Establish and maintain a formal style.</u></p> <p>e. <u>Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from the argument presented.</u></p> <p>6.W-4, WHST-4 <u>Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</u></p> <p>6.W-5, WHST-5 <u>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.</u></p> <p>6.W-8, WHST-8 <u>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.</u></p> <p>6.W-9, WHST-9 <u>Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</u></p>
<p>DOK/Difficulty Levels</p>	<p>Claim 4 Target 2 (PT: DOK 3, 4) Claim 4 Target 3 (PT: DOK 3, 4) Claim 4 Target 4(PT: DOK 3, 4) Claim 2 Target 7 (DOK 4) When there are two DOKs listed, DOK 3 is for machine-scored items and DOK 4 is for short-text items.</p>
<p>Stimuli/Passages</p>	<p>Informational and literary nonfiction texts: Includes the subgenres of articles, essays, memoirs, speeches, interviews, primary and secondary accounts, how-to articles, and functional reading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stimuli should be presented as a set of sources that students might authentically find through a search, in alignment with the context of the writing assignment. Stimuli for research (three or four for Grade 6) should have some references and footnotes/in-text citations resembling authentic research sources. • Stimuli should include information about the sources (including in-text citations for claims) that aids the student in assessing the relevance or usefulness of the information presented in the sources. • Sources must be rich enough to allow students to form a claim. Sources should not be encyclopedic or too general. • The set of sources should support both sides of an issue. The set of sources should be somewhat balanced so a particular argument is not privileged; the sources should allow for students to support different arguments. • Students should NOT be given a side to support, but should be able to choose the side they are supporting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The set of sources should together provide a comprehensive and richer collection of information than any one source alone and should encourage integration of information. Sources need some overlap of ideas to allow for analysis across texts. • Overall, the sources should offer more factual information and citations than just unsupported claims. <p>Literary fiction texts: Includes the subgenres of narrative fiction, short stories, poetry, and song lyrics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, although there might be some exceptions, stories or other works of fiction are generally not appropriate for these research tasks. • These stimuli should be used sparingly (within a set of 3–4 sources, only one may be a literary text). • If a literary text is used, it should be used to stimulate interest in a topic of research as a "linchpin" or focal source that spurs an investigation of informational/nonfiction texts. • If a literary text is used, informational/nonfiction texts must be included to set the context for making sense of or evaluating the literary text. • If a literary text is used, the focus of the research and writing task may not be literary analysis, but broadening an understanding of the text through contextual information. <p>Visual/graphic sources: Includes the subgenres of data tables and graphs, maps, info-graphics, timelines, diagrams, photographs, drawings, political cartoons, and artwork.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In any set of textual stimuli for research, visual/graphic sources that are included within the stimuli must serve a purpose other than to simply break up the text (e.g., making an abstract concept, idea, or process described in the source more understandable, providing additional information relevant to understanding the topic or subtopic). They should be highly relevant to the topic or subtopic of the source, and not introduce distracting or irrelevant information. • Visuals should not be so complicated that they add to the reading load. • Care should be taken in the selection of visual/graphic sources in consideration of accessibility issues for students with visual impairments. However, not ALL tasks must be accessible for visually impaired students. • If a PT uses the maximum number of sources allowed for a PT (four for Grade 6), one source may be a visual/graphic source in itself.
--	--

<p>Stimuli/Text Complexity</p>	<p>PT stimuli should follow the guidelines in the <i>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: English Language Arts & Literacy Computer Adaptive Test (CAT) and Performance Task (PT) Stimulus Specifications</i>; however, the complexity of the stimuli, taken as a whole, should be at approximately the lower end of the target-grade level. The vocabulary used in the stimulus and the item should be on or below-grade level. In some instances, vocabulary may be above-grade level as long as the stimulus has sufficient context to support the meaning of the word. In other cases, a complex authentic source that is at a reading level above the target grade (i.e., a historical primary source document) may be included, but these should be used with caution and with appropriate supports (e.g., historical context, definitions of key terms).</p>
<p>Key Vocabulary</p>	<p>Please be sure to bracket or footnote all key vocabulary that cannot be understood through surrounding context. Brackets should be used for short definitions (fewer than three words) of a word or term whereas footnotes are used where longer definitions are necessary. (See <i>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Style Guide</i>.)</p>
<p>Accessibility Concerns</p>	<p>Students will be required to read short and long stimuli, interpret information from text and/or graphic sources, and use a mouse. Students with physical impairments may need to use an adapted mouse or a computer with eye-scanning capabilities. Students who are visually impaired or blind may need enlarged or brailled text and picture descriptions of art. Illustrations that need to be interpreted will need to have detailed written descriptions in order for them to be accessible for students who are blind. Students with reading disabilities may need to read the text to themselves or use trackers or maskers to follow along. Students with visual-processing impairments may benefit from using a tracker or masker when reading. Other formats or supports may be necessary for students with other disabilities. The accommodations listed here are suggestions and could be altered depending on what accommodations will be allowable. Refer to the <i>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines</i> for information on accessibility concerns.</p>

<p>Evidence Required</p>	<p>Claim 4</p> <p><u>Target 2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information. 2. The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information in order to integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism. <p><u>Target 3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility of each source in order to select relevant information to support research. 2. The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the accuracy of each source in order to select relevant information to support research. 3. The student will evaluate the relevance of information from multiple sources to support research. <p><u>Target 4</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will select evidence to support opinions, ideas, or analyses based on evidence collected and analyzed. <p>Claim 2</p> <p><u>Target 7</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will 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.
<p>Allowable Item Types</p>	<p>2 short-text items, 1 machine-scored item, and an argumentative full write. Machine-scored item types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Choice, Single-Correct Response • Multiple Choice, Multiple-Correct Response • Hot Text, Select Text • Matching Tables
<p>Allowable Tools</p>	<p>Word processing tools including spell check</p>

Task Models

Classroom Activity	<p>A Classroom Activity provides instructions to the teacher and serves to introduce students to the topic or key vocabulary of the performance task. The activity provides an opportunity for activating students' prior knowledge and generating student interest in further exploration of the topic. It also provides students with an opportunity for interaction with the topic and with each other. The Classroom Activity may be up to 30 minutes in length, but should be simple and easy to implement with clear instructions. The Classroom Activity must be able to be linked to 5–6 PTs, in total, on the same topic.</p>
Performance Task	<p>Presenting the Sources: The sources should not be presented with "Read this story/article/letter to the editor." Students need to initially skim the sources with a purpose, be able to see the questions they will need to answer, and then go back and read the sources more carefully to find the answers.</p> <p>Sample Setup #1: "As part of your research, you have uncovered four sources.</p> <p>After you have reviewed these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly skim 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."</p> <p>Sample Setup #2: "You decide to do more research. While doing your research, you find three sources to review.</p> <p>After you have reviewed these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly skim 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."</p> <p>Task Description: The Student Directions should include a motivating setup for every task that provides a paragraph/scenario explaining in an engaging way the issue the student will be researching. The setup places the student in a role to complete a particular task related to the issue. This should be done by establishing the reason for and nature of the research to be done without giving away the final assignment (see examples below in Sample Assignments). The actual assignment for the full write will appear later when it is time to start that task, but the role and issue will allow the student to read with a purpose and a frame of reference.</p> <p>The performance task provides two short-text items and one machine-scored item on Claim 4 Targets 2, 3, and 4, and one Claim 2 Target 7 argumentative full write. The three Claim 4 items should build toward the full write by increasing the students' interaction with the sources in preparation for addressing the research demands of the full write.</p> <p>In the argumentative full write, the students will analyze relevant ideas and evidence from the sources and use them, in their own words, to logically argue their claim, elaborating when necessary and maintaining a clear focus throughout. Students should reference the sources used by title or number when integrating relevant information in their writing. The students will address a specific audience and purpose in each full write.</p>

	<p>After drafting the full write, the student will revise and edit, paying attention to clarity and accuracy as well as to language conventions (e.g., grade-appropriate grammar usage, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation).</p>
<p>Task Model 1 Item Type: Short Text DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information. <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in • Stimulus: No additional stimulus <p>Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explain how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. Provide two pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of the other two sources, to support your explanation. Identify the source of each piece of evidence by title or number. ○ While the purpose of each source is different, some of the sources [make similar claims/have similar ideas]. Identify and explain one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. Provide two pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of the two sources, to support your explanation. Identify the source of each piece of evidence by title or number. ○ Source #1 describes <problem>. Explain how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader’s understanding of <problem>. Give two [details/examples] from Source #2 to support your explanation. ○ The sources discuss <fact/idea> and <fact/idea>. Explain how the two <facts/ideas> are connected. Use two details, one detail from Source #1 and one detail from Source #2, to support your explanation. For each detail, identify the source by title or number. <p>Note: The facts/ideas selected should require the students to perform a synthesis instead of providing a regurgitation of the facts/ideas.</p>

**Rubric
Task Model 1a:**

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. The explanation is supported by two pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of the other two sources. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence.
1	<p>Response is a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. The explanation is supported by two vague or loosely related pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of the two other sources. Student cites the source for each detail.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. The explanation is supported by two pieces of evidence from one source. Student cites the source.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. The explanation is supported by one piece of evidence from one source. Student cites the source.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the [image/table/map] in Source #1 [supports/contradicts] the information provided in two other sources. The explanation is supported by two pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of the other two sources. Student does not cite the source for each piece of evidence.</p>
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

Task Model 1b:

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. The explanation is supported by one piece of evidence from each of the two sources. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence.
1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. The explanation is supported by one piece of vague or loosely related evidence from each of the two sources. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. The explanation is supported by two pieces of evidence from one source. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. The explanation is supported by one piece of evidence from one source. Student cites the source for the piece of evidence. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of one [claim/idea] that is shared by at least two of the sources. The explanation is supported by one piece of evidence from each of the two sources. Student does not cite the source for each piece of evidence.
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the claim/idea is insufficient.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

Task Model 1c:

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader's understanding of the problem described in Source #1, supported by two [details/examples] from Source #2.
1	Response is a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader's understanding of the problem described in Source #1, supported by two vague or loosely related [details/examples] from Source #2. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader's understanding of the problem described in Source #1, supported by [one detail/example] from Source #2.
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

	<p>Task Model 1d:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="418 262 581 289">Score Point</th> <th data-bbox="586 262 1406 289">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 296 581 415">2</td> <td data-bbox="586 296 1406 415">Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 422 581 989">1</td> <td data-bbox="586 422 1406 989"> Response is a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one vague or loosely related detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by two details from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the details. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student does not cite the source for each detail. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 995 581 1022">0</td> <td data-bbox="586 995 1406 1022">Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score Point	Description	2	Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail.	1	Response is a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one vague or loosely related detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by two details from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the details. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student does not cite the source for each detail.	0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant.
Score Point	Description								
2	Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail.								
1	Response is a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one vague or loosely related detail from each of the two specified sources. Student cites the source for each detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by two details from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the details. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from one of the specified sources. Student cites the source for the detail. OR Response is an adequate evidence-based explanation of how <fact/idea> and <fact/idea> are connected supported by one detail from each of the two specified sources. Student does not cite the source for each detail.								
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant.								
<p>Task Model 2 Item Type: Hot Text, Select Text DOK Level 3</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information. <p>Description: The student will locate sentences that present information that supports/contradicts and does not merely represent new or different information the claim mentioned in the stem. The delimited text should be an excerpt from one of the sources. There should be six to eight sentences that are delimited; however, regardless of the number of answer options and correct responses, the correct responses must equal less than half of the total answer options. The correct answer choice(s) should be sentences that clearly support/contradict the claim mentioned in the stem. If there are too many defensible options (check every possibility) do not use this item type, use multiple-choice. Distractors are the delimited sentences that should reflect common student errors. Plausible distractors for this model might include: 1) a sentence that is on topic but does not present supporting/contradicting information for the claim found in the stem and/or 2) a sentence that contains the same wording from the claim mentioned in the stem but does not present supporting/contradicting information. Rationales should state the justification for why the plausible distractor is incorrect. Provide rationales for all the distractors in the delimited text.</p>								

	<p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: G6.T2. Excerpt from one of the sources. Stems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Source #2 says <claim/idea>. Click on [two/three] sentences in the excerpt from Source #3 below that [support/contradict] this [claim/idea]. ○ Source #2 says <quote>. Click on [two/three] sentences in the excerpt from Source #3 below that [support/contradict] this [claim/idea]. • Clarifications: The stem should appear above the excerpt, not after it. 								
<p>Task Model 3 Item Type: Short Text DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information in order to integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism. <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: No additional stimulus Stems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While avoiding plagiarism, explain what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by paraphrasing the information. Identify the sources by title or number. ○ While avoiding plagiarism, explain how information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by paraphrasing the content. Identify the sources by title or number. <p>Rubric Task Model 3a:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 1150 1398 1787"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Rationale</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites sources by title or number.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what only one of the specified sources says about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student does not cite sources by title or number.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score	Rationale	2	Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites sources by title or number.	1	Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what only one of the specified sources says about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student does not cite sources by title or number.	0	The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.
Score	Rationale								
2	Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites sources by title or number.								
1	Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what only one of the specified sources says about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student cites source by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of what Source #1 and Source #2 say about <idea/subtopic from sources> by appropriately paraphrasing the information while avoiding plagiarism. Student does not cite sources by title or number.								
0	The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.								

	<p>Task Model 3b:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 262 1398 751"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="418 262 540 296">Score</th> <th data-bbox="545 262 1398 296">Rationale</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 302 540 415">2</td> <td data-bbox="545 302 1398 415">Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 422 540 688">1</td> <td data-bbox="545 422 1398 688">Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student does not cite sources by title or number.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 695 540 751">0</td> <td data-bbox="545 695 1398 751">The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score	Rationale	2	Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number.	1	Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student does not cite sources by title or number.	0	The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.
Score	Rationale								
2	Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number.								
1	Response provides a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student cites sources by title or number. OR Response provides an adequate evidence-based explanation of how the information from Source #1 is [similar to/different from] the information in Source #2 by appropriately paraphrasing the content without plagiarizing. Student does not cite sources by title or number.								
0	The response is incorrect, insufficient, or irrelevant for this question, or the response plagiarizes information from one or more source.								
<p>Task Model 4 Item Type: Multiple Choice, Multiple-Correct Response DOK Level 3</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 2:</p> <p>2. The student will analyze information within and among multiple sources of information in order to integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.</p> <p>Description: The student will choose the sentences that correctly paraphrase and integrate information from both sources mentioned in the stem that are provided in the performance task. The answer choices will present six to eight paraphrased sentences related to the sources; however, regardless of the number of answer options and correct responses, the correct responses must equal less than half of the total answer options. The answer choices may give credit to the authors of the stimuli, but if one answer choice gives credit, then they should all follow that pattern. Do not use in-line citations when giving credit. To avoid outliers, be sure the answer choices are all the same length, staggered in length, or balanced per length (i.e., three short, three long). Order the answer choices from shortest to longest. The correct answer choice will be two or three notes that correctly paraphrase and integrate information drawn from both sources. Distractors will reflect common student errors. Plausible distractors for this model might include: 1) a non-objective paraphrased note, 2) an inaccurate paraphrased note based on prior knowledge or opinion, 3) a paraphrased note that is omitting an important piece of information, 4) a paraphrased note that is an opinion or speculation, 5) a paraphrased note that includes information that is prior knowledge and not in either source, 6) a paraphrased note that reflects information that is presented in one source, but not both sources, 7) a note that plagiarizes language by using too much of the wording of the source (no more than one plagiarized distractor for this item type), 8) a paraphrased note that plagiarizes the ideas in one or both sources, and/or 9) a paraphrased note that is a misinterpretation of the information in one or both sources. Rationales should state the justification for why the plausible distractor is incorrect.</p>								

	<p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in <p>Stimulus: No additional stimulus</p> <p>Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choose the [two /three] answers that correctly paraphrase information about <topic> by combining information from both Source #1 and Source #2. 								
<p>Task Model 5 Item Type: Short Text DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility of each source in order to select relevant information to support research. 3. The student will evaluate the relevance of information from multiple sources to support research. <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in <p>Stimulus: No additional stimulus</p> <p>Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explain which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic or subtopic>. Support your explanation using two pieces of evidence from the most credible source. ○ All of the sources provide information about <topic/idea/claim>. Which source would be most relevant to students researching <topic/idea/claim>? Justify and support your answer with two [details/pieces of evidence] from the most relevant source. <p>Rubric Task Model 5a:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 1224 1398 1730"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score Point</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two pieces of evidence from the identified source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two vague or loosely related pieces of evidence from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by one piece of evidence from the identified source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score Point	Description	2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two pieces of evidence from the identified source.	1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two vague or loosely related pieces of evidence from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by one piece of evidence from the identified source.	0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.
Score Point	Description								
2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two pieces of evidence from the identified source.								
1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by two vague or loosely related pieces of evidence from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based explanation of which source most likely has the most credible information about <topic/subtopic> supported by one piece of evidence from the identified source.								
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.								

	<p>Task Model 5b:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 262 1398 800"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="418 262 586 310">Score Point</th> <th data-bbox="591 262 1398 310">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 317 586 436">2</td> <td data-bbox="591 317 1398 436">Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 443 586 737">1</td> <td data-bbox="591 443 1398 737">Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the identified source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 743 586 800">0</td> <td data-bbox="591 743 1398 800">Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="418 814 1195 846">Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score Point	Description	2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source.	1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the identified source.	0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.
Score Point	Description								
2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source.								
1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the identified source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information for students researching <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the identified source.								
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.								
<p>Task Model 6 Item Type: Multiple Choice, Single-Correct Response DOK Level 3</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the credibility of each source in order to select relevant information to support research. <p>Description: The student will identify the source that is most credible regarding a specific topic given in the stem. The answer choices should be explanations of why two different sources that are provided in the performance task are the most credible regarding a given topic. Provide two explanations for one of the sources mentioned in the stem and two explanations for the other source mentioned in the stem. To avoid clueing, be sure that the answer choices do not contain wording from the topic mentioned in the stem or contain a balance of wording across the options. To avoid outliers, be sure that the answer choices are about the same length, staggered evenly, or balanced per length (i.e., two short, two long). Order the choices from shortest to longest. The correct answer choice should be one explanation that correctly identifies the most credible source regarding a given topic and includes the correct explanation of why that source is the most credible regarding a given topic. Distractors are the sentences that should reflect common student errors. Plausible distractors for this model might include: 1) explanations for sources that are not the most credible regarding a given topic and/or 2) explanations for sources that are the most credible but the explanation given for the credibility is inaccurate. Rationales should state the justification for why the plausible distractor is incorrect.</p> <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: No additional stimulus Stem: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authors of Source #1 and Source #2 present information about <topic>. Choose one answer that identifies the source that is most likely the most credible and correctly explains why. 								

<p>Task Model 7 Item Type: Short Text DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 3:</p> <p>2. The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the accuracy of each source in order to select relevant information to support research.</p> <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: No additional stimulus Stems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which source contains the most relevant information that accurately supports information in Source #1? Justify and support your answer using two pieces of evidence from the most relevant source. ○ Source #1 and Source #2 provide [facts/statistics] about <topic/idea/claim>. Which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim>? Justify and support your answer with two [details/pieces of information] from the sources. <p>Rubric Task Model 7a:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="414 865 1396 1283"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score Point</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by two pieces of evidence from the most relevant source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 and an adequate evidence-based justification of why the source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by one piece of evidence from the most relevant source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score Point	Description	2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by two pieces of evidence from the most relevant source.	1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 and an adequate evidence-based justification of why the source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by one piece of evidence from the most relevant source.	0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.
Score Point	Description								
2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by two pieces of evidence from the most relevant source.								
1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 and an adequate evidence-based justification of why the source has the most relevant information that accurately supports the information in Source #1 supported by one piece of evidence from the most relevant source.								
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.								

	<p>Task Model 7b:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 262 1403 768"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="418 262 586 310">Score Point</th> <th data-bbox="591 262 1403 310">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 310 586 436">2</td> <td data-bbox="591 310 1403 436">Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 436 586 705">1</td> <td data-bbox="591 436 1403 705">Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the most accurate source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 705 586 768">0</td> <td data-bbox="591 705 1403 768">Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="418 783 1195 814">Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.</p>	Score Point	Description	2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source.	1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the most accurate source.	0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.
Score Point	Description								
2	Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source.								
1	Response is an identification and a limited/partial evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by two vague or loosely related [details/pieces of evidence] from the most accurate source. OR Response is an identification and an adequate evidence-based justification of which source provides the most accurate information about <topic/idea/claim> supported by one [detail/piece of evidence] from the most accurate source.								
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the source is insufficient.								
<p>Task Model 8 Item Type: Multiple Choice, Single-correct Response DOK Level 3</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 3:</p> <p data-bbox="467 919 1325 1003">2. The student will use reasoning, evaluation, and evidence to assess the accuracy of each source in order to select relevant information to support research.</p> <p>Description: The student will identify the source that most accurately supports the information given in another source that is provided in the performance task and mentioned in the stem. The answer choices should be explanations of why the other sources provided in the performance task most accurately support the information given in another source that is mentioned in the stem. To avoid clueing, be sure that the answer choices do not contain wording from the topic mentioned in the stem, or contain a balance of wording across the options. To avoid outliers, be sure that the answer choices are about the same length, staggered evenly, or that a balance of length is used (i.e., two short, two long). Order the choices from shortest to longest. The correct answer choice should be one explanation that correctly identifies the source that most accurately supports the information from another source mentioned in the stem.</p> <p>Distractors are the sentences that should reflect common student errors. Plausible distractors for this model might include: 1) explanations for sources that do not accurately support the information given in the source mentioned in the stem and/or 2) explanations for sources that do accurately support the information given in the source mentioned in the stem but the explanation given for why it supports the information is incorrect/misinterpreted. Rationales should state the justification for why the plausible distractor is incorrect.</p> <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: No additional stimulus Stem: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Source #1 presents information about <topic>. Choose one answer that identifies the source that most accurately supports the information in Source #1 and correctly explains why. 								

<p>Task Model 9 Item Type: Short Text DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 4, Target 4: 1. The student will select evidence to support opinions, ideas, or analyses based on evidence collected and analyzed.</p> <p>Appropriate Stems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-in: No lead-in Stimulus: No additional stimulus Stems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of the sources suggest <idea/claim/observation>. Provide two pieces of evidence, one piece of evidence from each of two different sources that support this [idea/claim/observation] and explain how each piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Identify the source for each piece of evidence by title or number. ○ The [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 supports the [claim/idea] that <claim/idea from multiple sources>. Provide two pieces of information, one piece of information from Source #1 and one piece of information from Source #3 that also support this [claim/idea]. Explain how each piece of information supports the [claim/idea] that <claim or idea from multiple sources>. For each piece of information identify the source by title or number. ○ Identify one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources>. Explain why it is a benefit. Provide two details, one detail from Source#1 and one detail from Source #2, to support your explanation. Be sure to identify the source of each detail by title or number.
--	--

Rubric
Task Model 9a:

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an identification of two pieces of evidence from different sources that support <idea/claim/observation> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how each piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence.
1	<p>Response is an identification of two pieces of evidence from different sources that support <idea/claim/observation> but does not provide an evidence-based explanation of how each piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of two pieces of evidence from different sources that support <idea/claim/observation> and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how each piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Student cites the source for each piece of evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of one piece of evidence from one source that supports <idea/claim/observation> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how that piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Student cites the source for the piece of evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of two pieces of evidence from different sources that support <idea/claim/observation> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how each piece of evidence supports the [idea/claim/observation]. Student does not cite sources.</p>
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect, irrelevant or blank.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

Task Model 9b:

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an identification of two pieces of information, one from Source #1 and one from Source #3, that support <idea or claim from multiple sources> and from the [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how each piece of information supports the [idea /claim]. Student cites the source for each piece of information.
1	<p>Response is an identification of two pieces of information, one from Source #1 and one from Source #3, that support <idea or claim from multiple sources> from the [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 but does not provide an evidence-based explanation of how each piece of information supports the [idea /claim]. Student cites the source for each piece of information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of two pieces of information, one from Source #1 and one from Source #3, that support <idea or claim from multiple sources> from the [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of how each piece of information supports the [idea/claim]. Student cites the source for each piece of information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of one piece of information, from either Source #1 or Source #3, which supports <idea or claim from multiple sources> from the [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how that piece of information supports the [idea/claim]. Student cites the source for the piece of information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of two pieces of information, one from Source #1 and one from Source #3, that support <idea or claim from multiple sources> from in the [chart/graph/table] in Source #2 and an adequate evidence-based explanation of how each piece of information supports the [idea/claim]. Student does not cite sources.</p>
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect, irrelevant or blank.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

Task Model 9c:

Score Point	Description
2	Response is an identification of one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of why it is a benefit. The explanation is supported by two details, one from Source #1 and one from Source #2. Student cites the source for each detail.
1	<p>Response is an identification of one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources> and a limited/partial evidence-based explanation of why it is a benefit. The explanation is supported by two vague or loosely related details, one from Source #1 and one from Source #2. Student cites the source for each detail.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of why it is a benefit. The explanation is supported by two details from one source. Student cites the source.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of why it is a benefit. The explanation is supported by one detail from one source. Student cites the source.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Response is an identification of one benefit of <idea found in multiple sources> and an adequate evidence-based explanation of why it is a benefit. The explanation is supported by two details, one from Source #1 and one from Source #2. Student does not cite the source for each detail.</p>
0	Response is an explanation that is insufficient, incorrect or irrelevant. Just identifying the benefit is insufficient.

Scoring Note: Score point 1 encompasses partially correct responses.

Task Model 10
Item Type: Matching Tables
DOK Level 3

Target Evidence Statement

Claim 4, Target 4:

1. The student will select evidence to support opinions, ideas, or analyses based on evidence collected and analyzed.

Description:

The student will match ideas/claims to a source number and title. To avoid clueing, do not use the same wording in the idea/claim as is used in the sources. The student should not be able to match the idea/claim to the source that supports it by simply matching the wording used.

The **correct answer choices** should fit clearly into one category listed on the table. If there are too many defensible options (check every possibility) do not use this item type, use multiple-choice.

Rationales should state the justification for why the plausible distractor is incorrect.

Appropriate Stems:

- **Lead-in:** No lead-in

Stimulus: No additional stimulus **Stems:**

- Click on the boxes to show the [claim(s)/idea(s)] that each source supports. Some sources may have more than one box selected.

Example of Formatting:

	Source #1: <Title>	Source #2: <Title>	Source #3: <Title>	Source #4: <Title>
<claim/idea>				
<claim/idea>				
<claim/idea>				

- Look at the [claims/ideas] in the table. Decide whether the information in Source #1, Source #2, both sources, or neither source supports each [claim/idea]. Click on the box that identifies the source that supports each [claim/idea]. There will be only one box selected for each [claim/idea].

Example of Formatting:

	Source #1: <Title>	Source #2: <Title>	Both	Neither
<claim/idea>				

- **Clarifications:** Matching tables should have no more than four correct answers at this grade level. If there are too many defensible options (check every possibility) do not use this item type, use multiple-choice.

<p>Task Model 11 Item Type: Full Write DOK Level 4</p>	<p>Target Evidence Statement Claim 2, Target 7:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The student will 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. <p>Argumentative Writing:</p> <p>Create an argumentative writing assignment that flows naturally from the research scenario given in the Student Directions (see “Task Description” above). An argumentative assignment must provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A purpose for writing A description of the audience A topic with multiple sides, one of which the student can argue supported by evidence from the sources about the topic <p>Sample Argumentative Assignment #1:</p> <p>The Student Council president has asked you for a recommendation about whether the school should have “junk food” in vending machines. She will use your recommendation in a speech about the issue at an upcoming student assembly. She will deliver the speech to an audience of other students, teachers, and parents.</p> <p>Your assignment is to use the sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative paper supporting or opposing vending machines that sell “junk food.” Make sure you establish an argumentative claim and support your claim with reasons and details from the sources you have read. Clearly organize your article and elaborate on your ideas. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to identify the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.</p> <p>Sample Argumentative Assignment #2:</p> <p>Your local school board, the group of people who make decisions regarding school policy, is holding a meeting to decide what programs to include at the school for the upcoming school year. The board is considering adding computer coding as a required course for graduation.</p> <p>Your assignment is to use the sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative letter to the school board supporting or opposing the inclusion of computer coding as a graduation requirement. Make sure you establish an argumentative claim and support your claim with reasons and details from the sources you have read. Clearly organize your article and elaborate on your ideas. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to identify the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.</p>
---	---

Sample Argumentative Assignment #3:

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 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 and support your claim from the sources you have read. Develop your ideas clearly and use our 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.

Sample Argumentative Scoring:

Your argumentative <writing assignment> will be scored using the following:

1. **Organization/purpose:** How well did you state 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 were 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?

Scoring Rules for the Performance Task:

2-point rubric for hand-scored research question responses

10-point analytic rubric for full write (4 points for organization/purpose; 4 points for evidence/elaboration; 2 points for conventions)

4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)					
Score	4	3	2	1	NS
Organization/Purpose	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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* 	<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"> 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* 	<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"> 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 * 	<p>The response has little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may be related to the claim but may provide little or no focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

4-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)					
Score	4	3	2	1	NS
Evidence/Elaboration	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated, relevant, and specific clear citations or attribution to source material effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques* vocabulary is clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose effective, appropriate style enhances content 	<p>The response provides adequate elaboration of the support/evidence for the 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate evidence (facts and details) from the source material is integrated and relevant, yet may be general adequate use of citations or attribution to source material adequate use of some elaborative techniques* vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose generally appropriate style is evident 	<p>The response provides uneven, cursory elaboration of the support/evidence for the 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some evidence (facts and details) from the source material may be weakly integrated, imprecise, repetitive, vague, and/or copied weak use of citations or attribution to source material weak or uneven use of elaborative techniques*; development may consist primarily of source summary 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 	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence (facts and details) from the source material is minimal, irrelevant, absent, incorrectly used, or predominantly copied insufficient use of citations or attribution to source material minimal, if any, use of elaborative techniques*; emotional appeal may dominate vocabulary is limited or ineffective for the audience and purpose little or no evidence of appropriate style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient (includes copied text) In a language other than English Off-topic Off-purpose

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

2-Point Argumentative Performance Task Writing Rubric (Grades 6-11)				
Score	2	1	0	NS
Conventions	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<p>The response demonstrates a partial command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<p>The response demonstrates little or no command of conventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> infrequent use of correct sentence formation, punctuation, capitalization, grammar usage, and spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.