



MAAP

Grade 5

**Writing Prompt**



## Purpose

This document will focus on student constructed responses for the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) Grade 5 writing assessment. It will provide knowledge of the scoring process for local and/or regional professionals to help guide classroom instruction.

The purpose of this document is to:

- provide a retired writing prompt and passage
- clarify scoring decisions as determined by the rangefinding process
- suggest additional prompts to be used with each passage

Below are some additional online resources/training:

- [Questar Writing Scoring Training Grades 3-4](#) (open in Internet Explorer or Firefox)
- [Questar Writing Scoring Training Grades 5-6](#) (open in Internet Explorer or Firefox)
- [Questar Writing Scoring Training Grades 7-8](#) (open in Internet Explorer or Firefox)
- [Questar Writing Scoring Training End-of-Course](#) (open in Internet Explorer or Firefox)

## Rubric

**Standard ID: W.5.1-3**

**Standard: Development of Ideas**

| Score of  |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| 4 points  | 3 points  | 2 points  | 1 point   | 0 points   |
| The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. Ideas are fully developed by using logical and convincing reasoning, well-chosen evidence from the text, and details that are specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. | The writing is generally clear and focused, and shows a general understanding of the given task. Ideas are adequately developed by using logical reasoning, sufficient and appropriate evidence from the text, and descriptions and details that are, for the most part, relevant and accurate based upon the text. | The writing is vague and shows only partial understanding of the given task. Ideas are somewhat developed by using some reasoning and some evidence from the text and descriptions and details that may be irrelevant, may be merely listed, and may or may not be found in the text. | The writing is unclear, and shows a lack of understanding of the given task. Ideas are developed with limited reasoning, little to no evidence from the text, and descriptions and details that are irrelevant and/or inaccurate. | The writing is unclear, shows no understanding of the given task, and uses no reasoning with little to no evidence from the text and descriptions and details that are irrelevant and/or inaccurate. |

**Standard ID: W.5.1-3**

**Standard: Writing Organization**

| Score of   |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 4 points   | 3 points   | 2 points   | 1 point   | 0 points  |
| <p>The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a purposeful, logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to easily follow the writer's ideas. Words, clauses, and transitions are used frequently and effectively to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains an effective introduction and conclusion that contribute to cohesiveness and clarity of the response.</p> | <p>The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. Words, clauses, and transitions are used effectively to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains an introduction and conclusion that contribute to the cohesiveness of the response.</p> | <p>The writing demonstrates evidence of planning with some logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. Words, clauses, and transitions are used somewhat consistently to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains a basic introduction and conclusion that contribute to cohesiveness that may be formulaic in structure.</p> | <p>The writing shows an attempt at planning, but the progression of ideas is not always logical, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or ideas. Words, clauses, and transitions are used sparingly and sometimes ineffectively to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. The writing contains an introduction and conclusion that are inappropriate and/or disconnected, resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity.</p> | <p>The writing lacks evidence of planning (random order) or a progression of ideas, making it difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or ideas. Words, clauses, and transitions are lacking or used ineffectively to clarify the relationships among claims, reasons, details, and/or evidence. There is a lack of an introduction and/or conclusion resulting in a lack of cohesiveness and clarity.</p> |

**Standard ID:** L.5.1 and 5.3

**Standard:** Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage

| Score of |          |  |   |   |
|----------|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 points | 3 points | 2 points   | 1 point   | 0 points  |
|          |          | <p>The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful. Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure. <b><i>The writing may contain a few minor errors in grammar and usage, but they do not interfere with meaning.</i></b></p> | <p>The writing maintains a tone inappropriate to task, purpose, and/or audience. Word choice is limited, clichéd, and repetitive. Sentences show little or no variety in length and structure, and some may be awkward leading to a monotonous reading. <b><i>The writing may contain a pattern of errors in grammar and usage that occasionally impedes meaning.</i></b></p> | <p>The writing fails to maintain tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Words are functional and simple and/or may be inappropriate to the task. The sentences may contain errors in construction or are simple and lack variety, making the essay difficult to read. <b><i>The writing may contain egregious errors in grammar and usage that impede meaning</i></b></p> |

**Standard ID:** L.5.2

**Standard:** Language Conventions of Mechanics

| Score of |          |  |   |   |
|----------|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 points | 3 points | 2 points   | 1 point   | 0 points  |
|          |          | The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a few minor errors in <b>mechanics</b> but they do not interfere with meaning. | The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain a pattern of errors in <b>mechanics</b> that occasionally impedes meaning. | The writing demonstrates very limited command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing may contain egregious errors in <b>mechanics</b> that impede meaning. |

**DIRECTIONS:** Read the passage and then answer the questions that follow.

## The Potter and the Washerman

Pam Hopper

- 1        Once there was a potter who made his living creating beautiful pottery from fine porcelain. Not far from the potter lived a washerman who earned his living making soiled laundry as bright and clean as new.
- 2        Both did well in their trades. However, the potter became jealous because he worried that the washerman was more successful than he was. He decided on a secret plan to ruin him.
- 3        The potter traveled to the palace and was granted an audience with the king. "What do you wish, potter?" asked the king.
- 4        "I have a simple request, Your Majesty," replied the potter. "My neighbor, the washerman, is very good at what he does. I would like to help my neighbor improve his business."
- 5        The king stroked his beard. "Why should the washerman's business be of any concern to you?" he asked.
- 6        The potter cleared his throat nervously and said, "Well, he is my neighbor, so naturally I desire what is best for him."
- 7        The king looked intently at the potter. "What did you have in mind, potter?"
- 8        "A challenge, Your Highness. I propose that my neighbor wash one of Your Majesty's esteemed elephants until it is spotlessly clean. To successfully complete a challenge like that would increase his business a hundredfold, I am certain."



9 Having revealed his plan, the potter's heart hammered so loudly he thought all would hear it. He hoped no one would guess the secret part of his plan: that the washerman's failure to complete such an impossible challenge would ruin his business forever.

10 "I will consider your request," said the king.

11 A few days later the potter was summoned before the king.

12 "I have just, spoken with the washerman," the king said, "and he is surprised by your concern for his well-being. He is also troubled by one difficulty with your idea, but knowing you are an accomplished potter, he thought you would be able to help him."

13 Help the washerman ruin himself? This was better than the potter had anticipated. "I am flattered by the washerman's request, Your Majesty."

14 "As you know," continued the king, "in order to clean the soiled article, the washerman puts it into a large porcelain basin with water and soap. The concern of the washerman is finding a porcelain basin large enough to wash an elephant. But then he remembered your exceptional talents as a potter, and he suggested that you create such a container."

15 This was terrible. Create a porcelain basin large enough for an elephant? Impossible. And yet, to refuse could destroy his own reputation. With trembling knees, the potter agreed.

16 After many weeks of work the elephant-sized porcelain bowl was finally ready. On the day of the challenge the king's largest elephant was brought to the courtyard. The basin was carefully unloaded from the wagon and filled with water and soap.

17 The washerman stood ready with his best scrub brushes. The elephant was led up the ramp. Trumpeting, it stepped slowly into the delicate basin.

18 Would the basin hold the elephant?

19 It would not!

20 With a crack, the porcelain basin shattered into a thousand  
pieces, sending a foamy river from the palace courtyard into the  
town below.

21 All the people in the courtyard held their breath. What would  
the king say?

22 The king smiled gently at the potter. "My elephant is waiting to  
be bathed, and the washerman waits to prove his ability to wash  
him spotlessly clean. Would you care to go home and create another  
basin so the washerman can do this?"

23 The potter gave great thought to his options and decided he had  
only one choice: he quickly left the palace courtyard and was never  
seen again.

24 As for the washerman, his wisdom so impressed the king that  
he became one of the most trusted advisers in the royal court.

"The Potter and the Washerman" From Highlights for Children Magazine,  
by Pam Hopper, June 1998. Copyright © 1998 by Pam Hopper. Used with  
permission of Highlights for Children Magazine.

### **Standard W.5.3**

**Read the following prompt and write your complete response in the space provided.**

You have read "The Potter and the Washerman." Imagine that you are the king. What would you do after the Potter comes to you with his idea about the Washerman washing the elephant? Write about what happens next from your point of view as the king. Provide key details and examples from the story to support your writing.

Your writing will be scored based on the development of ideas, organization of writing, and language conventions of grammar, usage, and mechanics.

I could not believe that potter suggested for the washman to wash my elephant! I knew from the moment the words left his lips he was planning something terrible, but I decided to humor him. Then the day of the washing came upon us, and I don't believe I've ever been more amused in any of my days. After that basin broke, I kindly asked him to craft another so the washerman could prove himself, and that crazy old potter fled the scene! I quickly gave orders to the maids and butlers standing outside to start cleaning up the mess, while one of them took the old elephant back into it's cage. While all of this commotion was occurring, I brought the washerman inside for a chat.

"You are very wise, young man. Asking the potter to make a large enough basin was quite genius. Tea?" I had offered him a cup as I sat in my throne. "No thank you, your Majesty. And thank you kindly sir. That old potter never seemed to enjoy my company. I was quite shocked when I had gotten the news that he wanted to assist me." I gave out a slight chuckle and offered him a seat. "Yes, well, humans are very comp-" Before I could finish my thought, a butler rushed into the throne room, sweat dripping down his face. I rose just as a hair-raising scream ripped its way through the silence. "Your Majesty! The old elephant has gone mad! She refuses to get back inside her cage," the butler spoke so fast his words jumped over each other as if they were playing leap frog. "Slow down! Send out every warrior you can find, I'll be down to help fight in one minute," I comanded him. "But sir, the entire army and yourself might be slaughtered!" He argued. "Now!" I barked, and he ran out of the room with a yelp. I ran my fingers through my hair and sighed, agitated. "I'm terribly sorry young man, you might want to be on your way," I spoke indirectly as I grabbed my sword. "Sir, if you don't mind, I could be of assitance. Fighting the old girl will just make her angry. You need to trick her back inside the cage."

The washerman explained his plan to me. "It's the only way to get her back inside without destroying the castle or killing your army," he said as he ran down the stairs and into the kitchen, finding any piece of food that an elephant might like to eat. I sprinted into battle, yelling for everyone to retreat. The elephant was trampling everything in its path, including my army members. "Everyone retreat! We need to find a way to calm her down enough to make her cooperate!" I bellowed. One warrior continued fighting, "Are you crazy?" he yelled, "This thing isn't going to calm down!" The washerman ran onto the field, a bag hanging around his waist. Without any hesitation, he grabbed a sword and swung at the elephant. The rest of the army joined him, backing her closer to the cage. The elephant screamed in

rage and tried to step forward, but a flying piece of apple distracted her. I joined the group and looked at the washerman, who began throwing pieces of food into the elephants cage. She ate the apple and thumped into the cage, devouring pieces of bread and cheese. Everyone joined together and slammed the cage door shut. "Young man, that was incredible!" I said to the washerman. "It was nothing special sir, she was just hungry," he responded with a slight laugh. I joined him in the laughter, and led the troop back inside.

"Fredrick, for your bravery and wisdom, I dub thee member of the royal court" I put a small sash over the washerman's clothes, and cheers filled the throne room. Fredrick smiled widely and looked down at his sash. "Thank you kindly, your Majesty. This is such a great honor," he looked back up and shook my hand. I smiled, "Oh please, you can call me Harry." The cheers turned into laughter, and the laughter turned into celebration until late into the night.

**Development of Ideas: 4**

The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. This response develops an effective narrative describing their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. This response effectively uses narrative techniques, such as dialogue, description, and pacing, to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations. This response is particularly effective in developing a regal voice that enhances the authenticity of the narrative (e.g., *"You are very wise, young man. Asking the potter to make a large enough basin was quite genius. Tea?" I had offered him a cup as I sat in my throne.*; *"Fedrick, for your bravery and wisdom, I dub thee member of the royal court"*; etc.). The events in the narrative are fully developed by using logical and convincing reasoning and details that are specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. The writing uses concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely. Each part of the narrative contains a wealth of descriptive language that is purposeful, effective, and advances the narrative. Overall, this response effectively develops an engaging narrative that fully addresses the given task.

**Writing Organization: 4**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a purposeful, logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to easily follow the writer's ideas. The introduction effectively engages and orients the reader by establishing a situation related to the ending of the original passage and introducing the narrator (e.g., *I could not believe that potter suggested for the washman to wash my elephant!*). This response organizes a logical event sequence that unfolds naturally, summarizing the events of the passage before moving into a related conflict about an elephant refusing to return to its cage. The writing makes use of a variety of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. The use of varied and original words, phrases, clauses, and transitions contributes to an even flow (e.g., *Before I could finish my thought, a butler rushed into the throne room, sweat dripping down his face.*). The response provides an effective conclusion that follows from the narrated experiences and events.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, utilizing vivid descriptive language (e.g., *"Now!" I barked, and he ran out of the room with a yelp.*) and establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *"You are very wise, young man. Asking the potter to make a large enough basin was quite genius. Tea?" I had offered him a cup as I sat in my throne.*). Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure, contributing to pacing and the successful development of narrative elements. The writing contains a few minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., use of *it's* instead of *its* and *elephants* instead of *elephant's*) that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The writing contains errors in punctuation (e.g., errors in comma use around dialogue) and spelling (e.g., *occurring, comanded, assitance*). However, these errors do not interfere with meaning and are relatively insignificant in comparison to the length of writing and what the student did correctly.

"King there is someone hear that wishes to speak to you" my loyal gaurd pronounced. I looked down from my high thrown while eating a few grapes, and to m surprise I saw the potter of the village. I asked why he came here, because I hadn't any nede for pottery. Then he told me that he wanted a challenge for the towns washer to do. It was to clean one of my biggest elephants. He said it was to make his buisness more succesful. I granted his wish, and as soon as the palace doors closed behind him I called my messenger. I told him to write a letter to the washer telling him to come down to the palace as soon as he could. Then within a few minutes the messenger was out of the front gate' and racing towards the town below. The washer walks up and bows down on his knees. I told him that there was no need for that. Then after he stood up I told him about the challenge. He excepted the challenge under one condition. That condition was to ask the potter to make the wash tub for the elephant. Just like the potter as soon as the palace gates shut behind the washer I yelled for my messenger. He wrote the letter, zoomed off on his horse and came back with the response I was hoping for from the potter, it was a yes. That night as I was looking out my window I tried to imagine how the challenge would play out. The potter thought I was stupid enough to not see what he was trying to do. Surely the potter was going to lose. Then as I thought of it more. I realised that my communittee was fighting, and i would hope that this would help them realise that some people could seem more talented at something then you are. But, you dont have to be jealous, because either carma is going to get you, or you might find something that your better at than them. So, the next day I had my messenger go to town to give the announcement for every one to come to the "compitition". When all the town was there my gaurds carefully unloaded the bowl, and brought the elphant in. I tried to hide the smirk I had, but it was almost impossible. The elephant was caked with dirt, and mud. I knew exactly what was about to happen, and I had a feeling that the towns people and the elephant also did too. the first foot went in, and with a horrible "CRACK" the giant wash bowl was shatterd. I told the potter why don't you just try to make another one. His faced turned red with immberrasment, and he stormed out. Then nobody in that town ever saw him ever again. I will make sure the story of the "Washer and the Potter" will be told as long as I am king to remember to not be jealous, but to admire other peoples talents.

**Development of Ideas: 4**

The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. This response develops an effective narrative describing their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washer man washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. This response uses narrative techniques, such as dialogue, description, and pacing, to develop experiences and events and show the responses of characters to situations. The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. The events in the narrative are fully developed by using logical and convincing reasoning and details that are specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. This response uses concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely. This is particularly effective when developing the king's internal monologue (e.g., *I realised that my communittee was fighting...; But, you dont have to be jealous, because either carma is going to get you...; etc.*), setting (e.g., *Just like the potter as soon as the palace gates shut behind the washer I yelled for my messenger.*) and in establishing a regal voice (e.g., *...my loyal gaurd pronounced. I looked down from my high thrown while eating a few grapes, and to m surprise I saw the potter of the village. I asked why he came here, because I hadn't any nede for pottery.*). Overall, this response crafts an effective narrative that is grounded in events from the passage but develops creative additional events and appropriate supporting details.

**Writing Organization: 3**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The opening line is effective in capturing the reader's attention while also introducing the narrator and establishing an effective regal voice that is consistently maintained (*"King there is someone hear that wishes to speak to you" my loyal gaurd pronounced.*). This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds logically. However, the writing makes inconsistent use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses, which contributes to a hurried pace and an uneven and disjointed flow. Errors in sentence construction also impede clarity and flow. The response includes an effective resolution to the events in the narrative (*Then nobody in that town ever saw him ever again. I will make sure the story of the "Washer and the Potter" will be told as long as I am king..*) and provides an appropriate moral to the story (*...remember to not be jealous, but to admire other peoples talents.*).

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *...my loyal gaurd pronounced. I looked down from my high thrown while eating a few grapes, and to m surprise I saw the potter of the village. I asked why he came here, because I hadn't any nede for pottery.*). Sentences are generally fluent and varied in length and structure, contributing to pacing and the successful development of narrative elements. However, there are errors in sentence construction, producing both run-on sentences and sentence fragments. The writing contains frequent minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., *hear* instead of "here", *thrown* instead of "throne", *excepted* instead of "accepted"), but they do not interfere with meaning. Overall, this response represents the low end of the "2" score point.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling), but represents a response on the low end of the "2" score point. There are noticeable errors in punctuation (e.g., errors in comma use, errors in punctuation around dialogue), capitalization (e.g., *...and i would hope..., the first foot went...*), and spelling (e.g., *gaurd, nede, challange, buisness, succesful, realised, communittee, carma, competition, elephant, shatterd, immberrasment*, etc.). Overall, these errors do not interfere with meaning especially considering this is a first draft.

What would you do if someone gave you the task of cleaning a huge elephant until it was spotless? I am the king and the potter came up to me one day and had just that request for the washerman to clean my biggest elephant. The potter stated that "To successfully complete a challenge like that would increase his business to a hundredfold, I am certain." I told him the washerman can take the challenge of cleaning my elephant because I knew what he was up to, of course.

At first I was just thinking how would cleaning an elephant help the washerman's business, but then it hit me like a baseball that he wanted to be more successful in his business by ruining the washerman's business. I called the washerman and told him about the potter's plans to ruin his business. The washerman could have just dug a hole and bathed the elephant in the hole, but we made the potter make a large porcelain basin which we knew would crack because of the size of the elephant. We did so because then the elephant would not be able to take a bath. We had our own plans to ruin his plans to ruin the washerman's business. The basin cracked when the elephant stepped into it and the potter was humiliated.

A potter can never fool the king! I will always outsmart him and rule with wisdom. Hopefully the potter has learned his lesson. As for the washerman, his business is booming. The potter's punishment is to clean the elephants since he thinks it would help the washerman then it should help him now that he has to find a way to build a very large and sturdy porcelain basin.



**Development of Ideas: 4**

The writing is clear, consistently focused, and shows a complete understanding of the given task. This response develops an effective narrative describing their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. This response uses narrative techniques, such as dialogue, description, and pacing, to develop experiences and events and show the responses of characters to situations. The writing effectively describes the internal monologue of the king, describing their reaction to the Potter's challenge and crafting a strategy *to ruin his plans to ruin the washermans business*. The events in the narrative are fully developed by using logical and convincing reasoning and details that are specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. This response uses concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely in both describing the internal monologue (e.g., *...but then it hit me like a baseball that he wanted to be more successful...*) and in establishing a regal voice (e.g., *A potter can never fool the king! I will always outsmart him and rule with wisdom.*). Overall, this response represents the lower end of the "4" score point.

**Writing Organization: 3**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The response opens with an introduction that adequately orients the reader by establishing a situation and introducing the narrator and characters. However, this introduction is awkward, opening with a rhetorical question that does not align with the narrative mode of the remainder of the response and an introduction to the narrator that is clunky (*I am the king...*). This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds naturally and begins by introducing characters and establishing the conflict before moving through the events of the narrative. The writing makes use of a variety of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. The response includes a conclusion that follows from the narrated experiences or events. While this paragraph provides effective resolution to the events in the narrative (e.g., *As for the washerman, his business is booming.*), there are also issues with clarity that impede flow (e.g., *The potter's punishment is to clean the elephants since he thinks it would help the washermans then it shoud help his now that he has to find a way build a very large and sturdy porcelain basin.*).

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *A potter can never fool the king! I will always outsmart him and rule with wisdom.*). Sentences are generally fluent and varied in length and structure, contributing to pacing and the successful development of narrative elements. However, there are several attempts at compound and complex sentences that are unsuccessful due to missing words or awkward syntax (e.g., *The potter's punishment is to clean the elephants since he thinks it would help the washermans then it shoud help his now that he has to find a way build a very large and sturdy porcelain basin.*). The writing contains several minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., use of *washermans* instead of the correct possessive form "washerman's") that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There are errors in punctuation (e.g., missing commas) and spelling (e.g., *elaphant, certian, shoud*, etc.). These errors are minor and do not interfere with meaning.

What would you do if you were a king and one day and you were approached by a potter, and he requested that his neighbor, the washerman must clean one of your royal elephants to help spread attention for his buissiness? Would you beleive it? What would you do afterward?

The potter in town just confronted me about helping his neighbor become more popular. He requested to use one of the royal elephants to clean, so that the washerman's buissiness would become more known. I'm going to have think this one over.

I have decided to call in the washerman, to see if he would like to take forward the potter's challenge. He approved.

I call back in the potter to tell him that the washerman accepted his challenge. When he finally reaches here and walks to me, I ask him to make a porcelain tub, big enough for a emense elephant to fit in. He stands there for a few moments. which is enough time for me to pick up on that he has fear. But he says that he will build it.

Many weeks later the potter arrived with the immense tub, and it looks like it can hold the elephant.

The washerman is also there, ready to impress me.

We have somebody bring the elephant out, and we put it in the washerman's hands, to bring up the ramp. The washerman and the elephant are near the end of the ramp, and the washerman begins walking forward with the elephant, until the elphant deposits itself into the tub, and then we hear a loud crack. The tub has flooded everything in sight, and the potter, embarressed and scared, ran away, before having to deal with the wrath of the king.

But I then send guards after him and they end up catching up with him. He is brought back and then sent to the jail. As for the washerman, I was amazed by his wiseness, therefore I made him a very trused advisor in the royal court.

As you can see, the potter's challenge was a set-up. How would you deal with it if you were king?

**Development of Ideas: 3**

The writing is generally clear and focused and shows a general understanding of the given task. While this response adequately develops a narrative describing their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king, a noticeable portion of the events are reliant on a summary of the passage (e.g., the initial request, the king thinking about it, the challenge itself, and finally making the Washerman an advisor in the royal court). This response utilizes narrative techniques, such as description and pacing, to develop experiences and events and show the responses of characters to situations. This response is particularly effective in establishing the king's interior monologue (e.g., *I'm going to have to think this one over.; ...to pick up on that he has fear.; ...I was amazed by his wiseness...*). The writing uses concrete words and phrases and sensory details to adequately convey experiences and events. Overall, the events in the narrative are adequately developed by using logical and convincing reasoning and details that are, for the most part, specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. This response would be strengthened with additional development of original narrative events beyond those found in the passage.

**Writing Organization: 3**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The response opens with an introduction that adequately orients the reader by establishing a situation and introducing the narrator and characters. However, this introduction is awkward, opening with a series of rhetorical questions that do not align with the narrative mode of the remainder of the response. This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds naturally. The narrative portion of the response begins by introducing characters and establishing the conflict before moving through the events of the narrative (e.g., *The potter in town just confronted me about helping his neighbor become more popular...*). The writing makes use of a variety of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events (e.g., *I call back..., Many weeks later..., etc.*). The response includes an effective resolution to the events in the narrative (e.g., *He is brought back and then sent to the jail. As for the washerman, I was amazed by his wiseness, therefore I made him a very trusted advisor in the royal court.*). The response closes with an adequate conclusion that, like the introduction, is engaging but does not align with the narrative mode of the remainder of the response.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, establishing an effective internal monologue that enhances the narrative (e.g., *I'm going to have think this one over. I have decided to call in the washerman, to see if he would like to take forward the potter's challenge.*). Sentences are generally fluent and varied in length and structure, contributing to pacing and the successful development of narrative elements. However, there are several attempts at compound and complex sentences that are run-ons (e.g., *The washerman and the elephant are near the end of the ramp, and the washerman begins walking forward with the elephant, until the elphant deposits itself into the tub, and then we hear a loud crack.*). The writing contains several minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., use of *he has fear* instead of "is fearful/afraid", use of *wiseness* instead of "wisdom") that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There are errors in punctuation (e.g., missing punctuation to break up run-on sentences) and spelling (e.g., *buissiness, beleive, emense, elephant, embarresed*, etc.). These errors are minor and do not interfere with meaning.

I looked at the potter with suspicion as he nervously walked out into the courtyard.

I sat on my throne and thought: this is a very unusual request. I must inform the washerman about this "challenge".

I had my talk with the washerman and we both agreed that this challenge was a foul one.

"As the potter was talking to me i noticed that his heart was beating loud and his legs were trembling." I informed the washerman. "That is not only suspicious, but it is as if he was nervous."

"If i may speak freely my Majesty, but i believe that the potter is trying to decieve you." he told me.

"I am already aware of this, so i propose we play a little trick on him" I suggested.

And at that moment, we came up a plan to turn the tables on the potter.

**Development of Ideas: 3**

The writing is generally clear and focused and shows a general understanding of the given task. This response adequately develops a narrative describing their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king, choosing to focus on the king's reaction to the Potter's idea and the initial conversations with the Washerman. This response utilizes narrative techniques, such as dialogue, description, and pacing, to develop experiences and events and show the responses of characters to situations. This response is particularly effective in establishing the king's interior monologue (e.g., *I sat on my throne and thought: this is a very unusual request. I must inform the washerman about this "challenge".*) and including appropriate dialogue (e.g., *"If i may speak freely my Majesty, but i believe that the potter is trying to decieve you." he told me.*). The writing uses concrete words and phrases and sensory details to adequately convey experiences and events. The events in the narrative are adequately developed by using logical and convincing reasoning and details that are, for the most part, specific, relevant, and accurate based upon the text. Overall, this response crafts an adequate narrative that is grounded in events from the passage but develops additional appropriate supporting details. This response would be strengthened with additional development regarding enacting the *plan to turn the tables on the potter*.

**Writing Organization: 3**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The opening line is effective in capturing the reader's attention (*I looked at the potter with suspicion as he nervously walked out into the courtyard.*). This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds logically. However, the writing makes inconsistent use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses, which contributes to an uneven and disjointed flow. Errors in sentence construction also impede clarity and flow. The response includes an effective concluding statement that leads into the events described in the passage (*And at that moment, we came up a plan to turn the tables on the potter.*).

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, utilizing vivid descriptive language (e.g., *I looked at the potter with suspicion as he nervously walked out into the courtyard.*) and establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *"If i may speak freely my Majesty, but i believe that the potter is trying to decieve you." he told me....*). Sentences are fluent and there are attempts at varying length and structure. However, the response relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *I looked..., I sat..., I had...*) and there are several unsuccessful attempts at compound sentences due to missing words and awkward syntax (e.g., *"As the potter was talking to me i noticed that his heart was beating loud and his legs were trembling." I informed the washerman.*). Overall, the writing contains a few minor errors in grammar and usage that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There are errors in punctuation, particularly around dialogue (e.g., missing commas and errors in punctuation placement). There are also errors in capitalization (e.g., repeated failure to capitalize "I") and spelling (e.g., *unusal, decieve*). Overall, these errors are minor and do not interfere with meaning.

In the story, "The Potter and the Washerman" the Potter tries to sabotage his opponent, the Washerman by getting him to try and wash the King's elephant. This plan does not work out for the Potter because the pot he makes to wash the elephant breaks and he goes into hiding.

If I were the king in this situation I would be confused but approve of the elephant being washed, mainly because the Potter and Washerman seem to be enemies. After this I would ask for the porcelain bowl to be made for the elephant to be washed, after learning the Potter was trying to sabotage his competitor's business.

Finally, when the day the Potter and Washerman arrive I would wait to see the Potter's failure when the giant flimsy bowl collapses under the elephant, then banishing the Potter from the kingdom.

In conclusion, if I were in the point of view of the king when the competition starts, I would know the potter's tricks and that he is trying to destroy his competition's business and get him to ruin his own reputation.

**Development of Ideas: 2**

The writing shows only partial understanding of the given task. This response successfully describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. However, this response is not in the narrative mode required by the given task. The response inconsistently utilizes narrative techniques, addressing what they would do as the king in brief hypotheticals (e.g., *If I were the king in this situation I would be confused but approve of the elephant being washed...*). These hypotheticals demonstrate partial understanding of the given task, as they provide limited development of a narrative and address what they would do as king. The writing makes use of concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely (e.g., *...sabotage his competitor's buisness., ...banishing the Potter from the kingdom.*). Overall, this response represents the high end of the "2" score point and would be strengthened by crafting a complete narrative that addresses the given task.

**Writing Organization: 3**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning and a progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The response opens with an introduction that adequately orients the reader by contextualizing the content of the response with a summary of the passage. While this response is not in the narrative mode required by the given task, there is a logical progression among the ideas explored. This response utilizes words, clauses, and transitions to move between ideas (e.g., *After this..., Finally...*) and address how they would respond if they were the king. The response closes with an adequate conclusion that, like the introduction, summarizes the content of the response but does not align with the narrative mode required by the given task.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, utilizing descriptive language that enhances the narrative (e.g., *...sabotage his opponent..., ...the giant flimsy bowl..., ...banishing the Potter from the kingdom.*). Sentences are fluent and there are attempts at varying length and structure. However, the response relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *...I would...*) and there are errors in sentence construction that produce run-on sentences (e.g., *After this I would ask for the porcelain bowl to be made for the elephant to be washed, after learning the Potter was trying to sabotage his competitor's buisness.*). Overall, the writing contains a few minor errors in grammar and usage that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There are errors in punctuation (e.g., errors in comma use, especially after transitions) and spelling (e.g., *trys, buisness*) that are minor and do not interfere with meaning.

If I was the king, the story would have changed. I'm about to tell what I would do if I was the king in this story.

I would accept the offer of the washerman washing my elephant. If I was king I would want the best for my village. I would want their businesses to thrive and them to be successful. The potter was very persuasive in this story. He seemed innocent and I would have thought he was doing good for the washer. The potter thought he got smart but after weeks of building his basin broke. Paragraph 20 says, "With a crack, the porcelain basin shattered into a thousand pieces". If I was the king I would have known by then it was all just a sick lie, but I wouldn't tell him to go make another one. I would tell him to apologize to the washerman. I would trust the washerman though because I know he's not lying to me. I would have the potter thrown in jail for disrespecting a man of such high honor.

Therefore, I would accept the offer of the washer cleaning my elephant, and I would not tolerate the behavior of the potter.



**Development of Ideas: 2**

The writing shows only partial understanding of the given task. This response successfully describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. However, this response is not in the narrative mode required by the given task. The response inconsistently utilizes narrative techniques, addressing what they would do as the king in brief hypothetical statements (e.g., *If I was king i would want the best for my village. I would want their bussnesses to thrive...*). These hypotheticals demonstrate partial understanding of the given task, as they provide limited development of a narrative and address what they would do as king. The writing makes use of concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely (e.g., *I would want their bussnesses to thrive..., The potter was very perswasive in this story. He seemed innocent...*). Overall, this response would be strengthened by crafting a complete narrative that addresses the given task.

**Writing Organization: 2**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning with some logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The response opens with an introduction that orients the reader by establishing a situation but is clunky and does not align with the narrative mode of the remainder of the response (e.g., *I'm about to tell what I would do if I was the king in this story.*). This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds naturally. The writing makes use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. However, the transitional phrases are repetitive (e.g., *If I was the king..., I would...*), which contributes to an uneven and disjointed flow. The response closes with a conclusion that summarizes the content of the response, but like the introduction, does not align with the narrative mode required by the given task.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *I would have the potter thrown in jail for disrespecting a man of such high honor.*). Sentences are generally fluent and varied in length and structure. However, the response relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *I would...*) and there are errors in sentence construction. The writing contains frequent minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., use of *was* instead of the subjunctive "were" and other errors around verb tense), but they do not interfere with meaning. Overall, this response represents the low end of the "2" score point.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling), but represents a response on the low end of the "2" score point. There are errors in punctuation (e.g., errors in comma use), capitalization (e.g. repeated failure to capitalize "I"), and spelling (e.g., *bussnesses, perswasive, inocentt, appoligise, tollarate*). Overall, these errors do not interfere with meaning.

If I was the king I would say no to the Potter's request. I would think it was a weird request, and I would be wondering why the Potter is trying to help his competition. I would tell him that if he wanted the elephant to be cleaned he could do it himself as a kind gesture toward the king, and that the Washerman could clean it to if he came to the castle and asked to clean the elephant. This way it could be fair and I would know if the potter was lying or not. If the potter came back and said the Washerman would wash the elephant I would want proof to make sure the potter was not lying. I would think that he was lying because I would be the king and i shold know things like tat because I would be wise and I would know if two very successful business onwers had a rivalery. In conclusion I would not accept his request and I would tellthe potter to wash the elephant himself unless the Washerman came to the castle and asked to wash the elephant.

**Development of Ideas: 2**

The writing shows only partial understanding of the given task. This response successfully describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. However, this response is not in the narrative mode required by the given task. The response inconsistently utilizes narrative techniques, addressing what they would do as the king in brief hypothetical statements (e.g., *I would say no, I would think it was a weird request, and I would be wondering why the Potter is trying to help his competition.* etc.). These hypotheticals demonstrate partial understanding of the given task, as they provide limited development of a narrative and address what they would do as king. The writing makes use of concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events (e.g., *I would think that he was lying because I would be the king and i shold know things like tat because I would be wise and I would know if two very successful business onwers had a rivalry.*). Overall, this response would be strengthened by crafting a complete narrative that addresses the given task.

**Writing Organization: 2**

The writing demonstrates evidence of planning with some logical progression of ideas that allows the reader to follow the writer's ideas. The response opens with an introductory statement that attempts to orient the reader by establishing a situation and introducing the narrator and characters (*If I was the king I would say no to the Potter's request.*). This response organizes an event sequence that unfolds naturally. The writing makes use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. However, the response relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *I would...*) and transitional phrases are repetitive, contributing to an uneven and disjointed flow. The presence of run-on sentences also contributes to a lack of clarity surrounding the sequence of events (e.g., *I would tell him that if he wanted the elephant to be cleaned he could do it himself as a kind gesture toward the king, and that the Washerman could clean it to if he came to the castle and asked to clean the elephant.*). The response closes with a conclusion that summarizes the content of the response but does not align with the narrative mode required by the given task.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, establishing a clear voice that enhances the narrative (e.g., *...he could do it himself as a kind gesture toward the king..., ...because I would be wise and I would know if two very successful business onwers had a rivalry.*). Sentences are generally fluent and varied in length and structure. However, the response relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *I would...*) and there are errors in sentence construction. The writing contains several minor errors in grammar and usage (e.g., run-on sentences, errors in verb tense) that do not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There are errors in punctuation (e.g., missing commas), capitalization (e.g., *...and i shold know things...*), and spelling (e.g., *shold, onwers, rivalry*) that are minor and do not interfere with meaning.

Hey I am the king and so the Potter just come to me and siad the Washerman is my neighbor and I am trying to do someing right so the Waserman have a business and I will like to help him or her to get the business up and mors .The Potter siad he will wash the elephants intell there are clane and not derty. ok would to litte the Potter do the help of the neighbor? yes or no why or why not ?I will said yes becaues the Potter want to do someing good and help other in the world. so will yu do it and before you do it you need to read the story and see will you and there you can see if you want to or no.

**Development of Ideas: 2**

The writing shows only partial understanding of the given task. This response develops a limited narrative that describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. However, the events described are reliant on a summary of the passage, and the significant errors in sentence structure impede pacing and contribute to a lack of clarity. While there are repeated attempts to utilize concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely, the presence of significant errors throughout the response limit the successful development of the narrative. This response also contains a misunderstanding of the passage, arguing that *the Potter want to do someing good and help other in the world*. Overall, this response represents the low end of the "2" score point and would be strengthened with additional original development of events in the narrative and increased clarity.

**Writing Organization: 1**

The writing shows an attempt at planning, but the progression of ideas is not always logical, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or ideas. There is a limited attempt to orient the reader by introducing the narrator and establishing the situation (*Hey I am the king and so the Potter just come to me...*). Events unfold logically, following the order outlined in the passage, but the lack of development and issues in grammar and usage and mechanics contribute to a disjointed and confusing sequence of events. The response fails to utilize transition words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. The response provides a limited concluding statement that does refer back to the given task (*so will yu do it...*). This response represents the low end of the "1" score point.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 1**

The writing demonstrates frequent errors in grammar and usage. Attempts are made to craft a variety of sentence structures, but nearly all of them are executed unsuccessfully. The frequent errors in grammar and usage lead to an uneven, awkward, and monotonous reading. The writing contains a pattern of errors in grammar and usage with numerous errors in sentence construction and verb tense (e.g., *the Potter just come to me*) that impedes meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 1**

The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The response contains numerous errors in punctuation, particularly in the lack of comma use and missing punctuation to break up run-on sentences. There are also errors in capitalization (e.g., *ok would...*). There are frequent spelling errors, particularly in grade-level vocabulary, that significantly impede clarity (e.g., *siad, someing, intell, becaues, yu, there*, etc.). Overall, the writing contains a pattern of errors in mechanics that impedes meaning.

I would say no because I would be suspicious about the offer. Based on what I know on business, they are very competitive because they want to ruin each other or get more money. In this case the potter is jealous and wants to ruin the washerman because the potter thinks that he is more successful than him. This is what the story says, "He decided on a secret plan to ruin him." His secret plan was, "I promise that my neighbor wash one of Your Majesty's esteemed elephants until it is spotlessly clean." I still would not agree because this is still very suspicious.

**Development of Ideas: 1**

The writing is unclear and shows a lack of understanding of the given task. The response fails to demonstrate consistent use of narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, and description, to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations. The development present is largely in support of the argument presented in the introductory statement (*I would say no because I would be suspicious about the offer.*). However, that claim constitutes an attempt to address the given task, describing their reaction to the Potter's offer and providing reasons why they would refuse the offer. The writing makes use of concrete words and phrases and sensory details to analyze the events described in the passage accurately (e.g., *Based on what I know on buisness,they are very competitive because they want to ruin each other or get more money.*). Overall, this response would be strengthened by crafting an original narrative, as required by the given task.

**Writing Organization: 2**

While this response is not in the narrative mode, the writing demonstrates evidence of planning. The progression of ideas is intended to support the argument presented in the introductory statement (*I would say no because I would be suspicious about the offer.*) rather than crafting a narrative that describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. Words, clauses, and transitions are used consistently to clarify the relationships among details and evidence in support of their claim. However, the variety of transition words, phrases, and clauses are not utilized to manage a sequence of events in a narrative. The response includes a limited concluding phrase that repeats the claim (*I still would not agree because this is still very suspicious.*). Overall, this response represents the low end of the "2" score point and would be strengthened by utilizing organizational strategies to craft a narrative, as required by the given task.

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 2**

The writing establishes and maintains tone appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. Word choice is precise, effective, and purposeful, clearly describing the motivations of the Potter (e.g., *Based on what I know on buisness,they are very competitive because they want to ruin each other or get more money.; I still would not agree because this is still very suspicious.*). Sentences are fluent and varied in length and structure, successfully integrating quoted textual evidence into their response. The writing contains one minor error in grammar and usage (*...what I know on buisness...*) that does not interfere with meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 2**

The writing demonstrates a consistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). There is one minor error in punctuation (e.g., missing comma after *In this case...*) that does not interfere with meaning.

You have me asked what I would do if I was the king. And I will tell you.

If I was in the point of view. I would ask the potter man why.

Is he doing such a thing. Why not stay with your biussins of making pottery for his living. And for what happed next potter needs to leave. The washer man should wash the elfin with something als

To come to a conushn do not try to ruinsum budy because they are better



**Development of Ideas: 1**

The writing is unclear and shows a limited understanding of the given task. This response develops a limited narrative that describes their reaction to the Potter's idea about the Washerwoman washing the elephant and what happens next from their point of view as the king. However, the events described are basic (e.g., largely focused on asking the Potter questions) and the significant errors in sentence structure impede pacing and contribute to a lack of clarity. While there are repeated attempts to utilize concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely, the presence of significant errors throughout the response limit the successful development of the narrative. Overall, this response represents the high end of the "1" score point and would be strengthened with additional original development of events in the narrative and increased clarity.

**Writing Organization: 1**

The writing shows an attempt at planning, but the progression of ideas is not always clear, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or ideas. There is a limited attempt to engage and orient the reader by providing context about the purpose for writing (*You have me asked what I would do if I was the king. And I will tell you.*). Events unfold logically, but the lack of development and issues in grammar and usage and mechanics contribute to a lack of clarity. This response makes ineffective use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events (e.g., *And for what happened next...*), which contributes to a disjointed and uneven flow. The response provides a limited concluding statement that does not identify an original moral the student gleaned from the passage (*To come to a conclusion do not try to ruin somebody because they are better*).

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 1**

The writing demonstrates frequent errors in grammar and usage. Attempts are made to craft a variety of sentence structures, but nearly all of them are executed unsuccessfully, generating numerous sentence fragments. The frequent errors in grammar and usage lead to an uneven, awkward, and monotonous reading. The writing contains a pattern of errors in grammar and usage (e.g., numerous errors in sentence construction and verb tense) that impedes meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 1**

The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The response contains numerous errors in punctuation (e.g., no end punctuation after two sentences). There are also numerous spelling errors, particularly in grade-level vocabulary, that significantly impede clarity (e.g., *biussins, elfin, als, conushn, sum budy*). Overall, the writing contains a pattern of errors in mechanics that impedes meaning.

The story is about the potter and the washerman by pam Hopper. there were once and potter lisen to the king.and potter loved to travel and he traveld to the placeandwas granted an audience with the king.

And potter allway's wanted to help his neighbor and he loved helping them do thingsand help people.and he had a requst,your Majestey,' ' repied the potter 'My neighbor, the washerman,is verey good at what he dose.Iwould liketo help my neighbor improve his business.

And he is verey nice to his neighbor and he loves to help them. and he is helping one of his neighbor with his business.

And he wish to talk to the master and tell him things about him and he is a nice man and he wants to tell the master to help the neighbor with his buisness.

**Development of Ideas: 0**

The writing is unclear and shows no understanding of the given task. The response fails to demonstrate consistent use of narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, and description, to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations. The development present is largely comprised of summary of the passage. There are also significant errors present in the summary, arguing that the Potter *is verey nice to his neighbor and he loves to help them*. The errors in grammar and usage and mechanics impede pacing and contribute to a lack of clarity. While there are attempts to utilize concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely, the presence of significant errors throughout the response limit the successful development of a narrative. Overall, the response is limited, based largely on an inaccurate reading of the passage, and dependent on summary, lacking necessary development of narrative elements.

**Writing Organization: 1**

The writing shows an attempt at planning, but the progression of ideas is not always clear, making it more difficult for the reader to follow the writer's message or ideas. There is a limited attempt to engage and orient the reader by providing context and introducing the main characters (*The story is about the potter and the washerman by pam Hopper. there were once and potter lisen to the king.*). There are logical connections between the ideas explored, but there are significant misunderstandings of the passage, a lack of development, and issues in grammar and usage and mechanics, all of which contribute to a lack of clarity. The writing uses basic and repetitive transitional words, phrases, and clauses to clarify the relationships among details and analysis (e.g., repeated use of *and*), which contributes to a disjointed and uneven flow. The response provides a limited conclusion that repeats the inaccurate central claim (*...he is a nice man and he wants to tell the master to help the neighbor with his buisness.*).

**Language Conventions of Grammar and Usage: 1**

The writing demonstrates frequent errors in grammar and usage. Attempts are made to craft a variety of sentence structures, but nearly all of them are executed unsuccessfully, generating numerous run-on sentences and sentence fragments. The response largely relies on sentences with similar structure (e.g., *And...*) and contains frequent errors in grammar and usage, which produces an uneven, awkward, and monotonous reading. The writing contains a pattern of errors in grammar and usage (e.g., numerous errors in sentence construction and verb tense) that impedes meaning.

**Language Conventions of Mechanics: 1**

The writing demonstrates an inconsistent command of the conventions of standard English (punctuation, capitalization, spelling). The response contains numerous errors in punctuation (e.g., lack of spacing between words and sentences, errors around dialogue), capitalization (e.g., numerous sentences do not begin with a capital letter), and spelling (e.g., *lisen, traveld, allway's, requist, repied, verey, dose, buisness*, etc.). Overall, the writing contains a pattern of errors in mechanics that significantly impedes meaning.

## Additional Potential Prompts for this Passage

### Standard W.5.1

- You have read "The Potter and the Washerman," a passage about a competition for the king. Who do you think is more clever: the king, the potter, or the washerman? Provide key details and examples from the story to support your writing.

### Standard W.5.2

- You have read "The Potter and the Washerman," a passage about a competition for the king. Compare and contrast the potter and the washerman. Provide key details and examples from the story to support your writing.
- You have read "The Potter and the Washerman," a passage about a competition for the king. Explain how the characters' response to the competition relates to the theme of the passage. Provide key details and examples from the story to support your writing.
- You have read "The Potter and the Washerman," a passage about a competition for the king. Describe how the potter's character changed from the beginning of the story until the end. Provide key details and examples from the story to support your writing.



# Questar®

**Questar Assessment Inc.**

5550 Upper 147th Street West

Minneapolis, MN 55124

(800) 688-0120

[www.questarai.com](http://www.questarai.com)