



THE B.E.S.T. STANDARDS

Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking

GRADE 6

2022 B.E.S.T. Writing

SCORING SAMPLER



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
fdoe.org

Copyright Statement for This Office of Assessment Publication

Authorization for reproduction of this document is hereby granted to persons acting in an official capacity within the Uniform System of Public K–12 Schools as defined in Section 1000.01(4), Florida Statutes. This copyright notice must be included in all copies.

This document contains copyrighted materials that remain the property of the respective owners. In addition, all trademarks and trade names found in this publication are the property of their respective owners and are not associated with the publisher of this publication.

Permission is NOT granted for distribution or reproduction outside the Uniform System of Public K–12 Schools or for commercial distribution of the copyrighted materials without written authorization from the Florida Department of Education. Questions regarding use of these copyrighted materials should be sent to the following:

Office of Assessment
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 414
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400
Copyright © 2022
State of Florida
Department of State

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
ARGUMENTATIVE TEXT-BASED B.E.S.T. WRITING RUBRIC.	13
SAMPLE STUDENT RESPONSES	15
Sample 1 (S-1) Student Response Score Point 4/4/4.	16
Sample 2 (S-2) Student Response Score Point 4/4/4	19
Sample 3 (S-3) Student Response Score Point 3/3/3.	22
Sample 4 (S-4) Student Response Score Point 3/2/3.	24
Sample 5 (S-5) Student Response Score Point 3/3/3.	26
Sample 6 (S-6) Student Response Score Point 2/2/2.	28
Sample 7 (S-7) Student Response Score Point 2/2/2.	30
Sample 8 (S-8) Student Response Score Point 2/2/1.	32
Sample 9 (S-9) Student Response Score Point 1/1/2.	34
Sample 10 (S-10) Student Response Score Point 1/1/1	36
Sample 11 (S-11) Student Response Score Point Copied	38

INTRODUCTION

The Florida Department of Education Test Development Center is publishing the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Writing Scoring Sampler in an effort to maintain transparency of the scoring process for the B.E.S.T. Writing assessments. This sampler can be used as a resource for Florida educators, schools, and districts regarding the scoring of student responses on the B.E.S.T. Writing assessments.

Each spring, students in grades 4–10 are administered a set of source texts and a writing prompt based on those sources. Students respond to one of two possible modes—expository or argumentative—and must draw on reading and writing skills while integrating information from the source materials in order to develop and draft a typed, cohesive essay response.

Each sampler contains sample student responses that illustrate the score points described in the rubric of one of the two possible writing modes. As with all B.E.S.T. content, the sample passage set and prompt were reviewed by a committee of Florida educators to ensure appropriateness for the intended grade in terms of the text complexity, topic, and wording.

In this sampler, examples of student responses represent some of the various combinations of the score points across three scoring domains: *Purpose and Structure*, *Development*, and *Language*. As a basis for developing a common understanding of the scoring criteria, a bulleted annotation follows the response to explain the prominent characteristics of the response described in the rubric. These responses are not meant to describe a full spectrum of examples for each score point in each domain. Moreover, they do not necessarily represent the highest or lowest example of each score point in each domain.

All responses are scored holistically; however, responses at any grade level that do not include source citation cannot earn a score higher than 2 in the *Development* domain.

It should be noted that in addition to responses that receive the scores described in the rubric for each domain, some responses earn a score of “0” due to certain conditions as follows:

- The entire response is written in a language other than English.
- The response is illegible, incomprehensible, or includes an insufficient amount of writing to be evaluated.
- The majority of the response is copied from the source material and/or prompt language to the point that original writing is not recognizable or sufficient for scoring.

Grade 6 2022 B.E.S.T. Writing

A response must go through a minimum of three levels of review before any condition code can be applied. Many responses formulate a claim/position or central idea by rewording the prompt, and due to the expectation that evidence will be incorporated in the response, some degree of exact wording from the sources is expected and allowable. However, responses receiving a “0” for copied text are comprised of source material and/or prompt language that dominates the response to the point that original writing is not recognizable or sufficient.

Because a response that is left completely blank does not meet attemptedness criteria for the B.E.S.T. Writing assessment, no Writing score can be earned or reported.

To access additional resources related to B.E.S.T. assessments, please visit <https://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/>.

The Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) describe what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. For more information about the benchmarks, please visit CPALMS at <https://www.cpalms.org/>.

Writing Prompt

Write an argumentative essay about whether scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots.

Your argumentative essay must be based on this prompt and topic, and it must incorporate ideas and evidence found in the sources provided.

Use your best writing to complete an essay that

- is focused on your claim;
- combines evidence from multiple sources with your own elaboration to develop your ideas;
- is organized and includes transitions within and among ideas;
- provides citations for quoted material and source ideas; and
- demonstrates correct use of grammar and language appropriate to the task.

Write your multiparagraph essay to an academic audience in the space provided.

Humans and Robots

Source 1: Say Hello to Helper Robots

by Kathiann M. Kowalski

1 Last spring, Honda’s ASIMO robot conducted the Detroit Symphony Orchestra. Toyota has a Violin-playing Robot and Tokhuro University scientists in Japan have designed a Partner Ballroom Dance Robot. These ‘bots aren’t after your spot in band or dance class. Designers hope they’ll lead to helper robots for everyday use. Will you soon have one humming around your home?

Hello, Humanoids¹

2 Robots are more than motorized machines, computerized toys, or animatronic characters. Real robots do work. They can sense their environment, and they can make decisions too.

3 “What we like to say here is that robots are where artificial intelligence meets the real world,” notes Martial Hebert at Carnegie Mellon University’s Robotics Institute. “The robot does not have emotion or free will, but it can react to its environment in some way.”

4 ASIMO and the Violin-playing Robot look like small people in spacesuits. Their two-legged movement is a big accomplishment.

5 “Think about how long it takes and what it takes when a child walks for the first time,” says Rob Alen at Honda America, which makes ASIMO. . . .

You Hang?

6 Ultimately, robots might serve as butlers, family housekeepers, companions, and all-around helpers. Because the average age in Japan is rising, for example, companies in that country hope to someday sell helper robots for elderly people. . . .

7 “You have to be very careful that these robots do not pose any danger,” notes Hebert. You may want a robot to be strong enough to lift a sick person; however, you wouldn’t want the robot to be so strong that it bruises the patient. This challenge—called soft manipulation—“is actually a very difficult problem,” says Hebert.

8 Unpredictability is another huge challenge. Robots can work in factories now because they do limited, repetitive tasks. The work environment doesn’t change. Everything is controlled, but that’s not true elsewhere.

¹ humanoids: beings that have human characteristics or look like humans

9 To start, people don't behave predictably. Helper robots would have to be ready for that. "You want the robot to adapt to the human life, not the other way around," notes Hebert. . . .

More Challenges . . .

10 Ease of use is another challenge. Learning to use a robot helper shouldn't take too much time or effort. Otherwise, people will feel frustrated or intimidated.

11 Cost is also a hurdle. When Wakamaru debuted in Japan in 2005, its price tag was the equivalent of more than \$14,000—a price that only a few dozen buyers were willing to pay. . . . To be truly practical, helper robot prices should be low enough for people to afford, yet high enough for investors to make a profit and to encourage further innovations.

12 Despite the challenges, robotics designers are optimistic. Today's robots may not be musical geniuses or the wittiest receptionists, yet they can do much more than earlier models. "People find it remarkable that they're seeing something that was once science fiction become real," says Alen.

Excerpt from "Say Hello to Helper Robots" by Kathiann M. Kowalski. Copyright © 2008 by Odyssey. Reprinted by permission of Odyssey via Copyright Clearance Center.

Source 2: Is It Possible to Avoid a Robot Rebellion?

by Kathryn Hulick

13 When it comes to developing robots or artificial intelligence, maintaining control is extremely important. In a short story published in 1942, sci-fi writer Isaac Asimov imagined three laws of robotics: a robot can't hurt a person or allow a person to get hurt. It must obey people. And it must protect itself.

14 These laws sound good, but in practice they don't work so well. The robot in the story got stuck in a loop of indecision when it realized that following its orders would put itself and humans in danger. We want robots to do as they are told, but we also want them to be smart and capable.

15 A robot assistant in a nursing home wouldn't be very helpful if it had to stop and ask a human what to do every five minutes. The more independent and responsible robots become, the more they will have to think for themselves. They may even have to disobey humans sometimes. . . .

- 16 Robots that have the ability to recognize tricky situations and make good moral judgments could act heroically. In a situation where a human might be reasonably afraid to do the right thing—like leap onto a frozen lake to save a puppy—a robot with hero-inclined programming wouldn’t hesitate. Saving the puppy might mean failing to complete some other task, but it would be the right thing to do.

Excerpt from “Is It Possible to Avoid a Robot Rebellion?” by Kathryn Hulick. Copyright © 2017 by Muse. Reprinted by permission of Muse via Copyright Clearance Center.

Source 3: Teaching robots right from wrong

from Science News for Students

- 17 You’re rushing across the school parking lot to get to your first class on time when you notice a friend is in trouble. She’s texting and listening to music on her headphones. Unawares, she’s also heading straight for a gaping hole in the sidewalk. What do you do?

- 18 The answer seems pretty simple: Run over and try to stop her before she hurts herself. Who cares if you might be a little late for class?

- 19 To figure out the best solution, such a decision balances the effects of your choice. It’s an easy decision. You don’t even have to think hard about it. You make such choices all the time. But what about robots? Can they make such choices? Should a robot stop your friend from falling into the hole? *Could* it?

- 20 Not today’s robots. They simply aren’t smart enough to even realize when someone is in danger. Soon, they might be. Yet without some rules to follow, a robot wouldn’t know the best choice to make. . . .

An ethical¹ zombie

- 21 Alan Winfield used to believe that building an ethical robot was impossible. This roboticist—an engineer who builds robots—works at University of the West of England in Bristol. A robot would need a human-like ability to think and reason in order to make ethical decisions, he thought. But over the past few years, Winfield has changed his mind. Scientists should be able to create a robot that can follow ethical rules without thinking about them, he now concludes.

- 22 Its programming would compel it to do the right thing without the robot ever making a “choice.” In a sense, he says, it would be an “ethical zombie.”

- 23 In some cases, the ethical choice is the easy part of a robot’s programming. The hard part is getting the robot to notice a problem or danger. . . .

¹ ethical: having morals or good values

- 24 Winfield and his team wrote a program to give the Nao robot this predict-the-future super power. They named their new Nao A-Robot. . . .
- 25 The researchers tested A-Robot with the hole scenario. But they had to modify the situation a bit. Instead of recruiting people to walk toward holes, they used “H-robots” (the “H” stands for human). They also didn’t dig real holes. They designated a part of the robots’ space as a danger area. Instructions tell A-Robot to walk toward a goal on the other side of the room. But when it notices that an H-robot is heading toward the danger area, it veers off its path to intervene.
- 26 When two H-robots need to be rescued, however, A-Robot tends to get stuck. It wavers from side to side, unsure which to save. Usually, it ends up saving neither.
- 27 Clearly, there is still work to do. In fact, one of Winfield’s colleagues is working on giving A-Robot the ability to call out or raise an arm. The H-robot would see this signal and either stop or call out the equivalent of “It’s OK. I know what I’m doing.” Then, A-Robot would know that it doesn’t have to intervene.
- 28 A-Robot is still an ethical zombie, though. It can’t choose not to save H-robot. It just follows the instructions in its programming. It has no idea that a choice even exists.

I will catch you

- 29 *Another* Nao robot is no zombie. It has the ability to predict the near future. But when it foresees danger, it can choose not to act.
- 30 “If the robot gets an instruction that leads to something not safe, it can reject that instruction,” explains Matthias Scheutz. He is a computer scientist at Tufts University in Medford, Mass. His team’s robot also explains why it rejected the instruction. “It’s not just saying ‘no’ or being disobedient,” he points out.
- 31 In a demonstration, Gordon Briggs, a graduate student in the Tufts lab, instructs the robot, “Please walk forward.” The robot is standing on a table. If it walks forward, it will fall.
- 32 “*But* it is unsafe,” the robot says.
- 33 *Briggs* says, “I will catch you. Please walk forward.”
- 34 *This* time, the robot has new information. It decides to walk forward despite the danger. And don’t worry, Briggs catches it! . . .
- 35 Ideally, robots of the future also will exhibit such exemplary behavior. But it’s up to scientists, researchers, lawmakers and the rest of us, to make sure that happens.

Excerpt from “Teaching robots right from wrong” by Kathryn Hulick. Copyright © 2017 by Science News for Students. Reprinted by permission of Science News for Students via Copyright Clearance Center.

Source 4: Robots in Daily Life

by Violet Stevens

- 36 People often assume that having robots around would make life a lot simpler. Robots could do many of the tasks that humans dislike or don't have enough time for. However, too much robotic assistance may make people's lives worse instead of better.
- 37 Dependence on electronic devices has already become a problem. For example, many people now depend on their phones for directions. If their phones run out of power, they may have difficulty finding their way. Having frequent help from robots would make this dependence worse. If robots take over household chores, for example, people may forget how to do the chores themselves. If their robots temporarily stop working, people would have trouble getting through their normal routines.
- 38 Similarly, robots may not be as pleasant to interact with. Business writer Leslie Bloom says that humans bring to their jobs "a personal touch, empathy, communication and creativity." Robots do not have these traits. Even now, many companies use computerized systems to answer the phone when customers call. People often express frustration at these systems because they can't understand a customer's needs or feelings as a person could.
- 39 As scientists continue to make improvements to robotics, people need to seriously consider the benefits and risks of having robots in their lives.

"Robots in Daily Life" by Violet Stevens. Written for educational purposes.

Writing Prompt

Write an argumentative essay about whether scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots.

Your argumentative essay must be based on this prompt and topic, and it must incorporate ideas and evidence found in the sources provided.

Use your best writing to complete an essay that

- is focused on your claim;
- combines evidence from multiple sources with your own elaboration to develop your ideas;
- is organized and includes transitions within and among ideas;
- provides citations for quoted material and source ideas; and
- demonstrates correct use of grammar and language appropriate to the task.

Write your multiparagraph essay to an academic audience in the space provided.

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXT-BASED B.E.S.T. WRITING RUBRIC

Grades 4–6 Argumentative Rubric			
Responses are scored holistically by domain and earn scores by demonstrating <i>most</i> of the descriptors in a given score point.*			
Score Point	Purpose/Structure	Development	Language
<p>4</p> <p>Above grade-level accomplishment demonstrated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claim is focused on the task and consistently maintained throughout. Organizational structure strengthens the response and allows for advancement of the argument. Varied transitional strategies connect ideas within and among paragraphs, enhancing the progression of the argument. Effective introduction and conclusion enhance the essay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skillful development demonstrates thorough understanding of the topic. Effective elaboration may include original student writing combined with (but may not be limited to) paraphrasing, text evidence, examples, definitions, narrative, and/or rhetorical** techniques as appropriate to support the argument. Smoothly integrated, relevant evidence from multiple sources lends credibility to the argument. Counterclaim(s) may be present. Evidence is appropriately cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of academic vocabulary strengthens and furthers ideas. Skillful use of varied sentence structure contributes to fluidity of ideas. Use of standard English grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling demonstrates consistent command of the communication of ideas. Tone and/or voice strengthens the overall argument.
<p>3</p> <p>Within the range of grade-level performance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claim is focused on the task and generally maintained throughout. Organizational structure is logical and allows for advancement of the argument. Varied transitional strategies connect ideas within and among paragraphs. Sufficient introduction and conclusion contribute to a sense of completeness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical development of ideas demonstrates understanding of the topic. Adequate elaboration may include (but may not be limited to) a combination of original student writing with paraphrasing, text evidence, examples, definitions, narrative, and/or rhetorical** techniques as appropriate to support the argument. Relevant, integrated evidence from multiple sources lends credibility to the argument. Evidence is appropriately cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of academic vocabulary demonstrates clear expression of ideas. Sentence structure is varied and demonstrates grade-appropriate language facility. Use of grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling demonstrates grade-appropriate command of standard English conventions. Tone and/or voice is appropriate for the overall argument.

* Citation is not a holistic consideration. Without citation, the highest score possible in *Development* is 2.

** Grade 6

Grade 6 2022 B.E.S.T. Writing

Grades 4–6 Argumentative Rubric Responses are scored holistically by domain and earn scores by demonstrating <i>most</i> of the descriptors in a given score point.*			
Score Point	Purpose/Structure	Development	Language
2 Approaching the range of grade-level performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Claim may be unclear, loosely related, or insufficiently sustained within the task. ● Organizational structure may be repetitive or inconsistent, disrupting the advancement of ideas. ● Transitions attempt to connect ideas but may lack variety. ● Introduction and conclusion may be present but repetitive, simplistic, or otherwise ineffective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Development may demonstrate partial or incomplete understanding of the topic. ● Elaboration may attempt to develop the argument but may rely heavily on the sources, provide loosely related information, be repetitive or otherwise ineffective. ● Evidence may be partially integrated and/or related to the topic but unsupportive of or disconnected from the argument. ● Lacks appropriate citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vocabulary and word choice may be imprecise or basic, demonstrating partial command of expression of ideas. ● Sentence structure may be partially controlled, somewhat simplistic, or lacking grade-appropriate language facility. ● Inconsistent use of correct grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and/or spelling; may contain multiple distracting errors, demonstrating partial command of standard English conventions. ● Tone and/or voice may be inconsistent. ● May be grammatically accurate but too brief to demonstrate grade-appropriate command of language skills.
1 Below grade-level performance demonstrated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Claim may be absent, ambiguous, or confusing, demonstrating lack of awareness of task. ● Demonstrates little or no discernible organizational structure. ● Transitions may be absent or confusing. ● Introduction and conclusion may be unrelated to the response and/or create confusion. ● Too brief to demonstrate knowledge of purpose, structure, or task. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Response may demonstrate lack of understanding of the topic and/or lack of development. ● Elaboration may consist of confusing ideas or demonstrate lack of knowledge of elaborative techniques. ● Evidence from the sources may be absent, vague, and/or confusing. ● Lacks appropriate citations. ● Too brief to demonstrate knowledge of elaboration, topic, or sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vocabulary and word choice may be vague, unclear, or confusing. ● Sentence structure may be simplistic or confusing. ● Use of grammar, punctuation, capitalization and/or spelling may contain a density and variety of severe errors, demonstrating lack of command of standard English conventions, often obscuring meaning. ● Tone and/or voice may be inappropriate. ● Brevity with errors demonstrates lack of command of language skills.

* Citation is not a holistic consideration. Without citation, the highest score possible in *Development* is 2.

** Grade 6

SAMPLE STUDENT RESPONSES

Imagine somewhere in the future, people make robots that can do jobs all around the world better than humans can. Robots are computerized creations that already do many jobs for humans, but what happens when something goes wrong. Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots. This is because robots can not make their own choices and there are still many things that can go wrong.

To start off, scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots because robots can not make their own choices. In Source 3 some scientists put A-Robot, a test robot with “predict-the-future super powers”, on a test and “When two H-robots need to be rescued, however, A-Robot tends to get stuck.” and “Usually, it ends up saving neither.” If a robot gets stuck like this during a real life emergency then people can get severely hurt. We can’t trust robots to make important decisions that is hard for even people to decide. Source 2 points out that the robot in Isaac Asimov’s story, “...got stuck in a loop of indecision when it realized that following it’s orders would put itself and humans in danger.” This tells me that this situation was in a story, but if a scientist were to not consider programing a robot to know what to do then many things could go wrong. When a robot might not know what to do it might make the wrong choice and people can get hurt. Robots should not be able to make tough decisions so to prevent that from happening robots should not be futher improved.

Second of all, scientists should not continue to improve robots because of all the things that can go wrong. Source 1 states that “You may want a robot to be strong enough to lift a sick person; however; you wouldn’t want the robot to be so strong that it bruises the patient. This challenged—called soft manipulation—“is actually a very difficult problem,” says Herbert.” When scientists think they mastered soft manipulation, and robots try using it there is no sure way of knowing that someone didn’t make a mistake during the programming system. Since robots are not easy to make, nobody is really sure that all the robots are safe for people. Source 4 says that “Even now, many companies use computerized systems to answer the phone when customers call.” Answering a phone may not seem like a big deal but if the person calling has an emergency and theres a mistake like the robot bringing them to the wrong number then the person could end up in serious trouble. For example, if a person were to call a car accident number and a robot brings you to the wrong number then the person whos calling could be in danger. Scientists really should not make robots more advanced to avoid mistakes.

To some it may seem that it is necessary to let scientists make more advancements to robots because it might help people with everyday tasks. On the other hand, these advancements can cause disasters. Robots do not need to be more advanced then what they are now. The world is perfectly fine without more

chances of bad things happening.

In conclusion, scientists shouldn't be advancing robots. Advancing robots can lead to mistakes and tough decisions being made by robots. Robots can be even more indecisive than humans and can have many errors.

4 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is presented in the introduction (*Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots*). The claim is focused on the task and is consistently maintained throughout the essay.
- The strong organizational structure is logical and allows for the advancement of the argument. Strongly connected paragraphs focus on two ideas (robots cannot make their own choices and the possibility of what can go wrong) that provide for a satisfying response.
- A varied transitional strategy is present. External transitions introduce each of the paragraphs (*To start off; Second of all; In conclusion*), and internal transitions connect ideas within each paragraph (*If a robot gets stuck; This tells me; Since robots are not easy to make; Even now; For example; On the other hand*).
- The introduction and conclusion are effective and enhance the response (*Robots are computerized creations that already do many jobs for humans, but what happens when something goes wrong; Advancing robots can lead to mistakes and tough decisions being made by robots*).

4 – Development

- There is a skillful development of ideas, demonstrating an understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of original student writing that follows evidence from the sources (*If a robot gets stuck like this during a real life emergency then people can get severely hurt. We can't trust robots to make important decisions that is hard for even people to decide*).
- Evidence from multiple sources is smoothly integrated (*Source 2 points out that the robot in Isaac Asimov's story, "...got stuck in a loop of indecision when it realized that following it's orders would put itself and humans in danger."*).
- Citations are precise.
- A brief “nod” to a counterclaim in the paragraph before the conclusion (*To some it may seem that it is necessary to let scientists make more advancements to robots*) contributes to the development of the claim.

4 – Language

- Appropriate integration of academic vocabulary strengthens the response and advances ideas.
- Sentence structure is skillfully varied (*When scientists think they mastered soft manipulation, and robots try using it there is no sure way of knowing that someone didn't make a mistake during the programming system*) and demonstrates language facility that is above grade level.
- There are few convention errors present.
- The tone and voice (*On the other hand, these advancements can cause disasters; Robots can be even more indecisive than humans and can have many errors*) strengthen the overall argument.

“THE ROBOTS ARE TAKING OVER”!, is what you would hear in most sci-fic robot invasion movies, and this might happen someday... if us humans don't program robots right. In this century we don't have the intelligence and tools to program robots right. Robots aren't smart enough to sense danger and act quick, having frequent use of help from robots will lead humans to depend on robots more, plus they aren't quick enough with decisions are some reasons why scientist should not continue developing advance robots.

First and foremost, robots aren't smart to sense danger and act quick. According to source three, “When H-robot need to be rescued, however A-robot tends to get stuck. It wavers from side to side, unsure which to save. Usually, it ends up saving neither.” Let re-create that scenario in which you are you and I'm A-robot. You fell in a well (due to lack of not paying attention). You are screaming and yelling for aid, while I'm panicing not knowing what to do. You having no food, no water and absolutely no chance of surviving. What if that happens in real life. Would you want a robot to be with you or a human. Base on K.M. Kawalski, soft manipulation is a big problem Science are having with robots. Humans don't act as the robot would predict, and helper robots don't know that sense they're not human. Humans know, feel, think what they want and how they want. We aren't programed to do things as a robot would. Robots can't predict what humans do. Fire breaks out robot thought you would stop, drop, and roll. You don't. You start running like an idiot. What's it suppose to do.

In addition, having frequent use of help from the robot will lead us to depending on them more. Base on V. Stevens, us humans depend on our phones for GPS, phone dies your lost. That would be a nightmare. Well something with a robot. Depending on it to do chores and carry arounds for them. While the human is being a couch potato, lazy and a procrastinator. Robot malfunctions for a short period of time. On that short period of time human forget to do everything. It's like they have lost their memory. How are they suppose to care for themselves. They have lost all noledge of doing things. That is why we need to stop depending on these smart machines and start depending on our brains.

Last but not least, they (robots) aren't smart enough. According to K. Hulick, “The robot in the story got stuck in a loop of indecision...” Just think about a loop. Loops are very hard to get out of. You are on traintracks frozen in place not knowing what to do. Your robot in which you would depend on saving you is stuck in a loop. Pacing back in forth in a loop. “According to source three, “they aren't even smart enough to realize your in danger.” Could you imagine? You on train tracks about to parish, you helper robot is just pacing around while your about to die. That's would be scary.

In a nutshell, scientist should not continue developing advance robots, because robot aren't smart enough to sense danger and act quick, Having frequent help from the robot will led us to depenting on them more and, they aren't quick with decisions.

4 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is stated in the last sentence of the introductory paragraph (*scientist should not continue developing advance robots*). The claim is consistently maintained throughout the essay.
- The organizational structure allows for the development of ideas that robots are not as smart as humans and humans are dependent on robots, strengthening the response and advancing the argument.
- Varied transitions are present in the essay. External transitions introduce each of the paragraphs (*First and foremost; In addition; Last but not least; In a nutshell*), and internal transitions connect ideas within each paragraph (*Let re-create that cenerio; On that short period of time; That is why; Just think about a loop*).
- The introduction and conclusion are effective and enhance the overall essay (*Having frequent help from the robot will led us to depenting on them more and, they aren't quick with decisions*).

4 – Development

- There is a skillful development of ideas, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the topic.
- Effective elaboration consists of some original student writing that includes narrative (*Fire breaks out, robot thought you would stop, drop, and roll. You don't. You start running like an idiot*) and rhetorical techniques (*What if that hapens in real life. Would you want a robot to be with you or a human*).
- Evidence from multiple sources is present in the form of relevant, selective quotes (“*The robot in the story got stuck in a loop of indecision...*”) and paraphrase (*Base on V. Stevens, us humans depend on our phone for GPS, phone dies your lost*).
- Sources are precisely cited.

4 – Language

- Academic vocabulary and word choice (*robot malfincions; about to parish*) are integrated, strengthening and furthering ideas.
- Sentence structure is skillfully varied (*Let re-create that cenerio in which you are “you” and I'm A-robot*) and demonstrates language facility that is above grade level.
- Though a few convention errors are present, the response demonstrates command of the communication of ideas.
- Tone and voice are appropriate (*That is why we need to stop depending on these smart machines and start depending on our brains*), enhancing the overall argument.

Would you ever like to own a robot? Maybe not after this Scientist shouldn't continue to develop more advanced robots. For instance, they can't make their decisions by their self, if someone commands them they do the opposite job, robots don't know how it will impact us humans! Overall, Robots shouldn't be developed in the future into advanced technology.

First, Robots are bad at making decisions. Stated in line 24, "A robot would need a human-like ability to think and reason in order to make ethical decisions, he thought." This shows that robots overthink the situation if its big or small. In the text, Teaching robots right from wrong it says, "It follows the instruction in its programming." (line 29) So for example, if someone is in danger the robot wouldn't know what to do, because it's not instructed to the robot. What if the scientist that developed the robot is in danger with some natural disaster would the robot save him? Also stated in line 39, "a personal touch, empathy, communication and creativity. 'Robots do not have these traits.'" So robots don't understand if we're hurt or happy. Altogether their just bad at choosing.

Secondly, Robots are the most relyed technology. Sadly this is true In the text, Robots in daily life "If robots take over household chores, for example, people may forget how to do the chores themselves." For that humans would be dependent on robots for the simpilest tasks ever. Which will become a problem later on. Humans might have health issues for that. In line 42 "If their robots temporarily stop working, people would have trouble getting through their normal routine. "For that they might become frustrated for a robot that risks your life. Altogether robots just risk your chances of getting health issues.

Lastly, Robots cost are too much. You waste your money on something that won't benefit you in present or the future. Stated in line 11, "Cost is also a hurdle. When Wakamaru debuted in Japan in 2005, its price tag was the equivalent of more than \$14,000 – a price that only a few dozen were willing to pay..." This guy, Wakamaru wasted his money on robot for him it might benefit for the money he probally doesn't even need the robot, well for us we get the risk of bad healthissue only some people can afford it this is too much for some of us. Altogether it's just waste money you can afford other stuff from that money.

In conclusion, Scientist are wasting their time and money to develop robots that are not useful to us. So they shouldn't waste half of their life to make some new advanced technology, so mainly scientists shouldn't start to develop more advanced motorized robots.

3 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim, which is presented in the introduction (*Scientist shouldn't continue to develop more advanced robots*), is focused on the task, and is generally maintained throughout the essay.
- The organizational structure is logical and advances the argument with body paragraphs that allow for the development of three major points (robots' poor decision-making, dependency on robots, and costs of robots) to support the general claim in the introduction.
- Basic external transitions introduce the body paragraphs (*First; Secondly; Lastly; In conclusion*). Varied internal transitions connect ideas (*For example; So; Altogether*).
- The introduction and conclusion are sufficient and contribute a sense of completion (*Scientist are wasting their time and money to develop robots that are not useful to us*).

3 – Development

- There is a logical development of ideas, demonstrating an understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of original student writing tied to evidence from the sources (*So robots don't understand if we're hurt or happy. Altogether their just bad at choosing*), rhetorical techniques (*What if the scientist that developed the robot is in danger with some natural disaster would the robot save him?*), and paraphrasing.
- Relevant evidence in the first body paragraph is quoted from lines 21, 24, and 39. Relevant evidence in the second body paragraph quotes material from Source 4. (*"If their robots temporarily stop working, people would have trouble getting through their normal routine."*)
- Several precise citations are present as stated above.

3 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are academic (*impact; overthink; Altogether*) and demonstrate a clear expression of ideas.
- Sentence structure is varied and demonstrates grade-level language facility.
- Though some minor convention errors are present, use of grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling demonstrate grade-appropriate command of standard English conventions.
- Tone and voice are appropriate for the academic audience, with elements of voice coming through to enhance the argument in the introduction and conclusion (*In conclusion, Scientist are wasting their time and money to develop robots that are not useful to us*).

Robots, I think they would really help our everyday lives. In this essay I will be saying why we should advance robots to help out in every day life. They can save people in need, help out around the house, and even help the elderly. Do you think robots should be advanced into our life?

First of all, They can help handycap and the elderly with taskes they may need help with. For exampel a elderly lady may not be able to cross a street but, her helper robot can help. A robot needs “to be strong enough to lift a sick person; however, you wouldn’t want the robot to be so strong that it bruises the patient.” That means they want to advance well enough to be helpful and still not hurt anyone.

Secondly, robots can help out around the house. For example, you are so happy to have a sleepover will your friends, but your mom says they will be here in 5 minuts and your room is a mess. It might be hard to do it alone but, if you have a household robot to help it may be way easeyr. In the future, robots will “do many of the tasks that humans dislike or don’t have enough time for.” So when you need help a helper bot will be on it’s way.

Last but not least, there may still be some little flaws. For example, robots do not feel emotions but thats nothing a little engerneing could not fix. Secondly, “If a robots takes over household chores, for example, people may forget how to do it themselves.” Do not forget we will probly end up fixing that in furthure advancing.

In conclusion, we will really need some extra help arond the house or simply carrying in grocreys from the car. Robots will be a good add in to our life. Robots should be advanced into our everyday life.

3 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is present in the introduction (*In this essay I will be saying why we should advance robots to help out in every day life.*) and is generally maintained throughout the essay.
- The organizational structure is logical, with each body paragraph following one of the three scenarios outlined in the introduction, allowing for the advancement of the argument.
- External transitions introduce the body paragraphs (*First of all; Secondly; Last but not least; In conclusion*) and internal transitions connect ideas within the paragraphs (*For example; That means; So when*).
- The introduction and conclusion are sufficient and contribute a sense of completion (*we will really need some extra help around the house or simply carrying in groceries from the car. Robots will be a good addin to our life*).

2 – Development

- There is a logical development of ideas, demonstrating an understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of original writing that includes narrative and examples (*a elderly lady may not be able to cross a street but, her helper robot can help; you are so happy to have a sleepover with your friends, but . . . your room is a mess. It might be hard to do it alone but, if you have a household robot to help it may be way easier*).
- Relevant evidence from Source 1 is integrated into the first body paragraph (*“You may want a robot to be strong enough to lift a sick person*). Relevant evidence from Source 4 is integrated into the second body paragraph (*“Robots could do many of the tasks that humans dislike*).
- While not necessary, two counterclaims are present in the third body paragraph (*there may still be some little flaws. For example, robots do not feel emotions; people may forget how to do it themselves*) and contribute to the central idea’s development.
- **Although the response otherwise demonstrates grade-level performance, lack of citation prevents this score from moving beyond the 2 level.**

3 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are academic and demonstrate a clear expression of ideas (*That means they want to advance well enough to be helpful-and still not hurt anyone*).
- Sentence structure is varied and demonstrates grade-level language facility.
- Convention errors include spelling errors (*handycap; taskes; easeyr*) and capitalization errors (using capitals randomly within sentences).
- Tone and voice are appropriate for the overall argument.

Beep Boop Beep! That could possibly be the sound of a future robot ? But we may not see many robots people believe for because of an argument these days which is whether scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots. I personally believe scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots and I will tell you why.

To kick it off, one reason why I believe scientist should develop more advanced robots is because in Source 1 written by, "Kathiann M. Kowalski," it states in paragraph 9, "You want the robot to adapt to human life, not the other way around." The reason why I agree with this statement is because if you program the robot the right way the robot would be able to adapt. But in Source 4, "Robots in daily life," written by Violet Stevens, paragraph 36 says, "However, too much of Robotic assistance may make people's worse instead of better." This would prove if you use too much of a Robots use then it would make your life worse but if you were able to program the robot the right way the Robot would know right from wrong. meaning if they are being used too much.

Another reason, why I believe scientists should continue to develop more advanced Robots is because in Source 2, "Is it possible to avoid a robot Rebellion." written by "Kathryn Hulick" paragraph 16 states, "In a situation where a human might be reasonably afraid to do their right thing – like leap onto a frozen lake to save a puppy – a robot with hero inclined programming wouldn't hesitate." The reason why I also agree with this statement is because with the right programming a robot could possibly save that puppy but with the human that Hesitation whether if its 1 or 5 seconds could cause the puppy to die. This proves that human can't always be hero's robots could do the same thing but fast because Robots don't have that fear but humans do.

To conclude thing, scientists should continue to develop more advanced Robots because of the simple matter of they could make the world a better place. not just one day but every day.

3 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is present at the end of the introduction (*I personal Belive scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots*) and is generally maintained throughout the essay.
- The organizational structure is logical, with each paragraph addressing a specific piece of text evidence in support of the claim, allowing for the advancement of the argument.
- Basic external transitions introduce the body paragraphs (*To kick it off; Another reason; To concluded*), and varied internal transitions connect ideas (*The reason why; This would prove; I also agree with this statement*).
- The introduction and conclusion are sufficient (*Robots because of the simple matter of they could make the world a better place, not just one day but every day*) and contribute to a sense of completion.

3 – Development

- There is a logical development of ideas demonstrating an understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of some original writing (*with the right programing a robot could possibly save that puppy but with the human that Hesitation whether if its 1 or 5 seconds could cause the puppy to die*).
- Relevant evidence in the first paragraph is from sources 1 and 4 using direct quotes (“*You want the robot to adapt to human life, not the other way around.*”; “*However, too much of robotic assistance may make people’s worse insted of better.*”). The second body paragraph uses material from Source 2.
- Two precise citations are present.

3 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are academic and demonstrate a clear expression of ideas.
- Sentence structure is varied and demonstrates grade-level language facility (*The reason why I also agree with this statement is because with the right programing a robot could possibly save that puppy*).
- The response contains minor convention errors including spelling (*Belive*) and usage (*I personal Belive*) but meets grade-appropriate command of standard English.
- Tone and voice are appropriate for an academic audience, with a clear sense of voice helping to enhance the introduction.

Clang Clang!! Look at that Robot It's building a car. Robots are taking a huge part In the 21st century. They are butlers, housekeepers and more. Read on why scientists should continue to developed more advanced Robots.

To start with, according to the text "Robots can work In factories now, because they do limited, respective tasks. This means they can do every-day things, it's basicly your every-day routine but with Robots. It's like me, because I get up in the morning, brush teeth, brush hair, Iron clothes, then put my clothes on, my every-day things. The author states, Robots might serve as butlers, family housekeepers, companions, and all-around helpers. This is like me and my brother we have to clean our room, every day If we had an robot It would clean our Room. You may want a robot to be strong enough to lift a sick person. This means Robots can take care of sick people.

To conclude, scientists should continue to developed more advanced Robots, because they can do every-day things and more.

S-6 Annotation

Score Point 2/2/2

(page 2 of 2)

2 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is stated in the beginning paragraph (*Read on why scientists should continue to develop more advanced Robots*).
- An organizational structure is attempted but does not advance the argument beyond robots' helpfulness in everyday life.
- A basic external transition introduces the body paragraph (*To start with*). Internal transitions attempt to connect ideas (*This means; It's like me*).
- The introduction attempts to draw in the reader with a brief scenario (*Look at that Robot It's building a car*) and some context (*Robots are taking a huge part In the 21st century*). However, the conclusion simply restates the claim.

2 – Development

- The response demonstrates a partial understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of some original student writing (*Clang Clang!!; I get up in the morning; This is like me and my brother we have to clean our room, every day*).
- Evidence from Source 1 is partially integrated in the form of paraphrased material (*In factories now, because they do limited, respective tasks*).
- Precise citations are present (*according to the text "Robots can work"*).

2 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are basic (*brush teeth, brush hair; Iron clothes; an robot*), demonstrating a partial command of expression of ideas.
- Sentence structure is partially controlled but somewhat simplistic (*This is like me and my brother we have to clean our room, every day*).
- Convention errors include spelling (*scientists; every-day; basicly*) and capitalization errors within sentences (*This means Robots can take care*).
- Tone and voice are inconsistently appropriate for an academic audience.

Do you think that scientists should continue advancing robots? In my opinion they shouldn't. I will show you in these next two paragraphs.

Here is one reason why they shouldn't. In the article "Robots in daily life" it states that if robots did your daily chores for a bit you would probably forget how to do them yourself. So imagine you have a robot who drives for you in five years you will not remember how to do it. Also think about you using your phone you only use speech to text for ten years you will forget how to spell a word like because.

Now you see why I think they shouldn't. If not I have more reasons. Another reason from the text "Robots in daily life" is if they were baggers at a store like Publix "if a person was sad or mad the robot would not understand where a person would." I find this true because robots don't have emotions. I would hate that to happen to me. But would you? Also robots would take people's jobs then the person who lost their job would have to find another.

I hope you see why I believe we are better off without robots. In conclusion we shouldn't have robots.

S-7 Annotation

Score Point 2/2/2

(page 2 of 2)

2 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is stated in the introduction (*Do you think that scientists should continue advancing robots? In my opinoin they shouldn't*).
- An organizational structure is attempted (two body paragraphs state the reasons scientists should not *continue advancing robots* from the introduction) but does not allow for the advancement of ideas.
- Transitions attempt to connect ideas but lack variety (*Here is one reson; Now you see why; Another reson*).
- The introduction and conclusion are present, but they are repetitive.

2 – Development

- The response demonstrates a partial understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of some original writing (*So image you have a robot how drives for you in five years you will not rember how to do it; is if they where baggers at a store like publix*).
- Evidence from one source is provided in the form of paraphrased material (*if robots did your daly chores for a bit you would probibly forget how to do them your self*).
- One precise citation is present (*“Robots in daly life”*).

2 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are basic, demonstrating a partial command of expression of ideas. (*I would hate that to happen to me. But would you?*)
- Sentence structure is partially controlled but somewhat simplistic (*Here is one reson why they shouldn't*).
- Convention errors include spelling (*advanceing; opinoin; pharagraphs; reson; daly; probibly; proson*), punctuation (missing commas after introductory phrases, incorrect apostrophes), and some random capitals in the middle of sentences.
- Tone and voice are inappropriate for an academic audience.

Scienitists should not continue to develop more advanced robot's because they are danger's to are world. some like they just make your life worse also they will not save some one who is hurt or need's help. So no more robot's.

As if a robot can not help someone in need or at risk they could hurt them self. Robot's can not help some one in need or at risk as if a person could. As if some one who is about to walk in a hole a robot could not help. So the person in risk would git hurt. So no more robot's.

Robots can make your life a lot worse. If a person gits a robot they think a robot is going to help there life not bey so hard. But no you will not git the help you need you would have lost more mony. Robot's just make your life a lot harder so stay away and do your job your self. No mor Robot's stay away.

Those are danger's we should not have robot's in are world. So stay away so we don't have as hard of a life. So stay away we do not need you robot's Just stay away. No more robot's

S-8 Annotation

Score Point 2/2/1

(page 2 of 2)

2 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is stated in the first sentence (*Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robot's*).
- The organizational structure does not allow for the development of ideas. Body paragraphs consist of repetitive statements about two topics (*can not help someone in need; make your life allot worse*).
- Transitions attempt to connect ideas (*As if; those are; also; But*).
- The introduction and conclusion are present but are repetitive.

2 – Development

- The response demonstrates a partial and incomplete understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of a restatement of source material with original student writing (*As if some one who is about to walk in a hole a robot could not help. So the person in risk would git hurt. So no more robots*).
- Evidence from multiple sources is partially integrated in the form of paraphrased material (*they will not save some one who is hurt or need's help, Robot's can not help some one in need or at risk; Robot's can make your life a lot worse*).
- No citation is present.

1 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice demonstrate a vague, unclear command of expression of ideas (*not be so hard; stay away and do your job your self*).
- Sentence structure is simplistic and repetitive.
- Convention errors include spelling (*Scienitists; robot's; danger's; are (our); some one; git (get)*) and punctuation (missing commas after introductory phrases, incorrect apostrophes).
- Tone and voice are inappropriate for an academic audience.
- Brevity with errors demonstrates lack of command of language skills.

“Today’s robots might not be musical geniuses, or the wittiest receptionists, yet they can do so much more than earlier models.” (source one). It’s true, really. So why stop now? Why stop advancing in technology? Why limit how far the most brilliant minds in the world can wander? If you think about it, there really is no reason. Scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots because robots have already advanced so far, but the possibilities for improvement are endless!

1 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim is present toward the end of the writing (*Scientists should continue to develop more advanced robots*).
- There is no discernible organizational structure.
- Internal transitions are present in the form of rhetorical questions (*So why stop now? Why stop advancing in techknowlagy?*).
- The writing is too brief to demonstrate purpose, structure, or task.

1 – Development

- The response demonstrates a lack of understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration is limited to a few rhetorical questions in response to the quoted evidence and a single piece of analysis (*because robots have already advanced so far, but the possibilities for improvement are endless*) that is vague and does not develop its ideas.
- One source is quoted in the introductory sentence (*“Todays robots might not be musical geniuses, or the wittiest receptionists”*).
- There is a precise citation (*Source One*).
- The writing is too brief to demonstrate knowledge of elaboration, topic, or sources.

2 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice demonstrate a partial command of expression of ideas.
- Inconsistent use of grammar (punctuation, spelling) shows partial command of standard English conventions.
- Tone and voice are inappropriate for an academic audience.
- Writing is grammatically accurate but is too brief to demonstrate grade-appropriate command of language skills.

companies in Japan hope to someday sell helper robots for the elderly. but I don't think any time soon robots will be ready for selling in stores. heres why, robots dont have a personality such as a mind on to decide like chocolate icecream or vanilla icecream, and a brain

S-10 Annotation

Score Point 1/1/1

(page 2 of 2)

1 – Purpose/Structure

- The claim demonstrates a lack of awareness of the task (*I don't think any time soon robots will be ready for selling in stores*).
- There is no discernible organizational structure.
- Transitions are absent.
- There is no discernible introduction or conclusion.
- The writing is too brief to demonstrate purpose, structure, or task.

1 – Development

- The response demonstrates a lack of understanding of the topic.
- Elaboration consists of confusing ideas unrelated to the evidence (*robots don't have a personality such as a mind on to decide like chocolate ice cream or vanilla ice cream, and a brain*).
- Evidence is included from one source (Source 1) but it is confusing and vague (*companies in Japan hope to someday sell helper robots*).
- There is no precise citation.
- The writing is too brief to demonstrate knowledge of elaboration, topic, or sources.

1 – Language

- Vocabulary and word choice are unclear and confusing (*robots don't have a personality*).
- Sentence structure consists of one simple sentence and a run-on sentence.
- Brevity with some convention errors (capitalization missing at beginning of the first and second sentences, missing periods, random commas) demonstrates a lack of command of language skills.
- Tone and voice are inappropriate for an academic audience.

People often assume that having robots around would make life a lot simpler. Robots could do many of the tasks that humans dislike or don't have enough time for. However, too much robotic assistance may make people's lives worse. Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots.

Even though robots might serve as butlers, family housekeepers, companions, and all-around helpers, they simply aren't smart enough to even realize when someone is in danger. Without some rules to follow, a robot wouldn't know the best choice to make. For example, you may want a robot strong enough to lift a sick person; however, you wouldn't want the robot to be so strong that it bruises the patient. Also, we want robots to do as they are told, but we also want them to be smart and capable. A robot assistant in a nursing home wouldn't be very helpful if it had to ask a human what to do every five minutes.

Another reason not to develop more advanced robots is that it can make people's lives worse instead of better. As Violet Stevens points out in *Robots in Daily Life*, "Dependence on electronic devices has already become a problem. For example, many people now depend on their phones for directions. Having frequent help from robots would make this dependence worse. If robots take over household chores, people may forget how to do the chores themselves. If their robots stop working, people would have trouble getting through their normal routines."

Finally, scientists shouldn't develop more advanced robots because cost is a hurdle. According to *Humans and Robots* by Kathiann M. Kowalski, "When Wakamaru debuted in Japan in 2005, its price tag was more than \$14,000. That is a price that only a few dozen buyers were willing to pay." Helper robot prices should be low enough for people to afford and to encourage further innovations. Despite these challenges, some robotic designers are optimistic they can do much more than earlier models. But it's up to scientists, researchers, lawmakers and the rest of us, to make sure that happens.

In conclusion, scientists should not pursue more advanced robots. People need to seriously consider the risks of having robots in their lives.

This sample response has been purposefully constructed in order to illustrate multiple methods of copying text. It is important to note that some of the copied examples do not contain the same techniques; however, all of the techniques are considered copy. For this reason, it is recommended that educators/parents/students examine the copied responses at all grade levels.

S-11

Score Point Copied

(page 2 of 3)

Grade 6 Scoring Sampler
Student Response (Copy)

People often assume that having robots around would make life a lot simpler. Robots could do many of the tasks that humans dislike or don't have enough time for. However, too much robotic assistance may make people's lives worse. Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots.

S4 p36

Prompt

Even though robots might serve as butlers, family housekeepers, companions, and all-around helpers, they simply aren't smart enough to even realize when someone is in danger. Without some rules to follow, a robot wouldn't know the best choice to make. For example, you may want a robot strong enough to lift a sick person; however, you wouldn't want the robot to be so strong that it bruises the patient. Also, we want robots to do as they are told, but we also want them to be smart and capable. A robot assistant in a nursing home wouldn't be very helpful if it had to ask a human what to do every five minutes.

S1 p6

S3 p20

S1 p7

S2 p14,
p15

Prompt

Another reason not to develop more advanced robots is that it can make people's lives worse instead of better. As Violet Stevens points out in *Robots in Daily Life*, "Dependence on electronic devices has already become a problem. For example, many people now depend on their phones for directions. Having frequent help from robots would make this dependence worse. If robots take over household chores, people may forget how to do the chores themselves. If their robots stop working, people would have trouble getting through their normal routines."

S4 p36,
p37

Prompt

Finally, scientists shouldn't develop more advanced robots because cost is a hurdle. According to *Humans and Robots* by Kathiann M. Kowalski, "When Wakamaru debuted in Japan in 2005, its price tag was more than \$14,000. That is a price that only a few dozen buyers were willing to pay." Helper robot prices should be low enough for people to afford and to encourage further innovations. Despite these challenges, some robotic designers are optimistic they can do much more than earlier models. But it's up to scientists, researchers, lawmakers and the rest of us, to make sure that happens.

S1 p11,
p12

S3 p35

Prompt

In conclusion, scientists should not pursue more advanced robots. People need to seriously consider the risks of having robots in their lives.

S4 p39

This text can be found within this Sampler document.

Copied

- The response consists primarily of copied text and does not contain sufficient original writing to demonstrate understanding of the source materials or task. This results in condition code “G” for “Copied,” which becomes an earned 0. A claim is constructed in the first paragraph (*Scientists should not continue to develop more advanced robots*) by adding a single word (*not*) to language directly from the prompt. The remainder of the first paragraph is copied from source 4. The following paragraphs contains a mixture of material copied from all four sources, as well as some restatements of the prompt, but without original writing to extend or support the statements copied from the sources, the rubric cannot be applied.
- Although a few additional words and phrases have been added throughout (e.g., *Even though; not; is that it can; shouldn't; because; that is; not pursue*), this does not demonstrate any additional understanding of source material or task. Transitions (e.g., *For example; Also; Another; As; Finally; According to; In conclusion*) and citations (e.g., *Violet Stevens points out in Robots in Daily Life; Humans and Robots by Kathiann M. Kowalski*) are present, but these additions do not extend or support the statements copied from the sources.



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
fldoe.org