

Evidence and Revision Review Cards

A03 · v0.1.2 · Teacher guide and explanatory key

Provisional Grade 6 ELA practice in revising a short written response with relevant evidence from a printed fictional scenario.

Estimated preparation: 12 minutes. Planning estimate to review the key, select four cards, print/cut them, and prepare recording sheets; not teacher-timed.

Estimated teaching: 40 minutes for four selected cards. Planning estimate for four selected cards at about five minutes each plus time to introduce, compare, and discuss revisions; not classroom-tested. Use all sixteen over multiple sessions.

Teacher directions

Choose a few cards after relevant instruction. The deck groups four cards per move: add evidence (1–4), explain a link (5–8), narrow a claim (9–12), and remove/replace unsupported material (13–16).

Give learners card fronts and the recording sheet first; keep the teacher key separate until they have attempted a revision.

Accept any accurate, relevant, explained revision. Allow read-aloud, text-to-speech, dictation, or another established response method without supplying a revision. Allow extra paper when the recording space is insufficient. A revision may be a rewritten response or a precise instruction describing the replacement/addition; it must remove or correct unsupported statements that conflict with the revised point.

Use the three-part guide formatively. One response or a short set does not establish general writing mastery, reading proficiency, readiness, or a diagnosis.

Score each criterion independently as 0 or 1; total 0–3. Partial credit means earning some of these three points, not fractional points. Consider the revision and its explanation together. Concise combined wording may meet several criteria; an explicitly scoped claim can itself show the reasoning that limits it. A missing or uncaptured response is not enough evidence: check access and offer another opportunity rather than inferring a zero.

Use options

Independent practice

Assign one or more cards. Learners revise individually and record the evidence and reasoning before checking the key.

Partner coaching

One learner proposes a revision; a partner asks which printed detail supports it. Switch roles on the next card. Both may respond in writing or another established way.

Revision-move stations

Sort cards by the four revision moves. Learners complete a selected card and explain what the revision changed.

Whole-class model

Show one card without its key. Collect private first responses before discussing alternatives, then compare reasoning with the key.

Three-part scoring guide

Revision fit — 1 point: makes or precisely describes a concrete change that answers the card's question and improves the draft, correcting unsupported statements that conflict with the revised point. Accept: Adds, connects, narrows, or removes information in a way that matches the task. 0 points: no concrete revision, a revision that does not answer the question, or a conflicting unsupported statement is retained. Different well-supported revisions can earn credit; wording need not match the key.

Evidence use — 1 point: accurately uses the relevant detail or details requested by the task from the printed scenario. Meet any stated count, measurement, comparison or time requirement. Accept: Names a stated action, result, count, or comparison that bears on the question. 0 points: required evidence is missing, inaccurate, invented or merely present without bearing on the question. A quotation is not required.

Reasoning — 1 point: makes clear how the detail supports, qualifies or limits the revised response. The connection may be expressed within a concise revised sentence or its accompanying explanation. Accept: States why a detail answers the question or why the revised claim is narrower than the evidence. 0 points: the connection is absent, inaccurate or contradicted by the scenario. A properly bounded claim can show reasoning through its stated scope; no fixed sentence frame or separate explanation sentence is required.

Sources and rights: all sixteen situations, excerpts, prompts, and sample drafts are original fictional text written for A03. No outside passage, image, quotation, or factual claim is used.

Support and extension

Support

Task context: Question: What change helped someone follow the watering rota? Revise the draft with one precise detail from the passage and explain how that detail supports your answer.

Read one card aloud or use text-to-speech, let the learner mark one relevant detail, and allow dictation or an established communication route. Keep the same revision and evidence goal.

Extension

Task context: Question: What test evidence supports the choice to add rails? Remove the unsupported point comment and replace it with the before-and-after observations and what they show in this test.

Invite learners to write a second defensible revision and compare which version most directly answers the question. Treat this as additional practice, not a norm-referenced score.

Explanatory key · Card 1

Card 01 — The Garden Rota

Revision focus: Add relevant evidence

The garden crew asked whether its watering rota was easy to follow. The first draft used green dots, but two learners could not tell which day each dot meant. Tavi added a weekday name beside every dot. During the next check, four learners matched their assigned day without asking. Student draft: “Tavi made the rota better. It had green dots.”

Task: Question: What change helped someone follow the watering rota? Revise the draft with one precise detail from the passage and explain how that detail supports your answer.

One strong revision

Tavi wrote a weekday beside each dot, so a learner could match the mark to the correct day. The next check, when four learners found their day without asking, shows how that change helped.

Why it improves the draft: The weekday labels directly answer what changed. The follow-up check connects that detail to use; the green color alone does not explain how to read the rota.

Also accept: Tavi added weekday names beside the dots so learners could tell which day to water.

Also accept: Replace the color detail with the day labels: four learners then matched their day without asking, showing the labels helped them read the rota.

Interpretation note: Accept the added day labels and a clear link to finding a day. Do not award full credit for repeating that the dots were green. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 2

Card 02 — Return Bins

Revision focus: Add relevant evidence

At the club library, returned books were left on one long table. Helpers sorted by title, but two books went to the wrong shelf because the labels were hard to see. Rina put a letter on each return bin and repeated that letter on the shelf map. In the next round, helpers placed seven books into matching bins. Student draft: “Rina’s bins looked bright.”

Task: Question: What change helped books reach the correct shelf? Revise the draft with a specific detail and explain why it answers the question.

One strong revision

Rina labeled each return bin with the same letter used on the shelf map. Helpers then put seven books in the matching bins, showing how the repeated letters guided sorting.

Why it improves the draft: The matching bin and map letters are a direct sorting cue. The later round gives an observable result; brightness alone does not explain where a book belongs.

Also accept: Rina put matching letters on the bins and shelf map, giving helpers a cue to sort books toward the correct shelf.

Also accept: Replace the brightness claim with the matching letters: helpers used them to place seven books into matching bins in the next round.

Interpretation note: Accept the matching labels and a connection to sorting. Do not require the learner to claim that every book was placed correctly. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 3

Card 03 — The Cardboard Bridge

Revision focus: Add relevant evidence

The makers' group tested a cardboard bridge by setting the same block near one edge. On the first try, that side bent. Lee folded two narrow cardboard strips and taped them beneath the base. The group repeated the same test, and the edge stayed level. Student draft: "Lee was careful while building the bridge."

Task: Question: What change helped the bridge hold its shape in the test? Revise the draft with evidence from the passage and explain what the repeated test showed.

One strong revision

Lee taped two folded cardboard strips beneath the base. When the group repeated the same block test, the edge stayed level, which supports that the added strips helped in that test.

Why it improves the draft: The support strips are the concrete change, and the same test provides a comparison. "Careful" describes Lee but does not identify evidence about the bridge.

Also accept: Lee added folded strips beneath the bridge; the edge stayed level under the same block, showing the strips helped in this test.

Also accept: The supports beneath the base helped in the repeated test because the same block no longer bent the edge.

Interpretation note: Keep the claim limited to this described test. Do not accept a claim that the bridge can hold any weight. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 4

Card 04 — Lantern Directions

Revision focus: Add relevant evidence

A pair of learners paused while assembling a paper lantern because the arrow on step three pointed away from the tab. Asha redrew the arrow toward the tab and numbered the steps in order. The next pair followed the page through the fold without asking where to begin. Student draft: “Asha made the page colorful.”

Task: Question: What revision helped a new pair follow the lantern directions? Add one specific piece of evidence and explain how it relates to the question.

One strong revision

Asha turned the step-three arrow toward the tab and numbered the steps. The next pair followed the fold without asking where to begin, showing how clearer cues helped them proceed.

Why it improves the draft: The corrected arrow and numbered order address the point where learners paused. The next pair's action links the changes to following the directions.

Also accept: Asha pointed the arrow toward the tab, showing the next pair where to fold so they could continue.

Also accept: Numbering the steps gave the next pair an order to follow, and they continued without asking where to begin.

Interpretation note: Accept either the corrected arrow or ordered steps with a clear link. Color is not the evidence of clearer directions. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 5

Card 05 — The Talk Token

Revision focus: Explain how evidence supports a point

The design club wanted each person to share one idea before anyone spoke a second time. The group placed a wooden token in the middle after each turn. When a learner finished, the next person picked it up. In a trial round, all four members shared once before a second turn began. Student draft: “The group used one token. It worked fairly.”

Task: Question: How did the token routine help the group take turns? Keep the relevant detail in the draft and add a sentence that explains how it supports the claim.

One strong revision

The group moved the token to the next speaker after each turn, giving a clear turn cue. In the trial, all four members shared once before a second turn began, so the routine met the group's goal in that round.

Why it improves the draft: The draft names the object but not the procedure. Explaining the handoff connects the token to the one-turn-each goal without claiming that everyone agreed it was fair.

Also accept: Moving the token to the next person helped organize turns: all four members spoke once before a second turn in the trial.

Also accept: The token marked whose turn came next, helping the group meet its one-turn-each goal in the trial round.

Interpretation note: Accept a clear explanation of the handoff. Avoid treating “fair” as a proven feeling shared by every member. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 6

Card 06 — Measure Before Cutting

Revision focus: Explain how evidence supports a point

Jun needed a strip of paper to cover a shelf label. Instead of cutting right away, Jun measured the shelf with a paper strip and checked the width twice. The first paper cut fit across the label, and the remaining paper stayed in the supply box. Student draft: “Jun measured twice. The paper strip matched the shelf.”

Task: Question: How did measuring first help Jun? Add a sentence that connects the relevant detail to the result in the passage.

One strong revision

Checking the width before cutting let Jun choose a strip that fit the shelf label. The first cut fit, while the unused paper stayed available for another task.

Why it improves the draft: The draft gives the measurement detail but leaves its purpose unstated. The fit of the first cut shows how the check helped Jun choose the needed size.

Also accept: Measuring the shelf first helped Jun cut a strip that fit on the first try.

Also accept: Checking the width helped Jun choose the needed size, leaving the remaining paper available in the supply box.

Interpretation note: The text supports a fit and saved remainder in this scene, not a general rule about all measuring or cutting. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 7

Card 07 — Prop Table Diagram

Revision focus: Explain how evidence supports a point

The stage crew kept the original prop diagram by the auditorium door. Crew members had to walk there to check where each item belonged. Mina posted a second copy beside the prop table. At the next rehearsal, the crew checked the nearby copy and returned the props to the marked spots. Student draft: “Mina put another diagram near the props. The crew returned the items.”

Task: Question: Why did placing a second diagram by the prop table help? Explain how the detail in the draft supports the crew’s action.

One strong revision

With the diagram beside the table, crew members could check each item’s marked place while putting props away instead of walking back to the door.

Why it improves the draft: The two details are related, but the draft does not say why the location mattered. The nearby copy puts the reference where the crew is doing the task.

Also accept: The nearby diagram let crew members check the marked places as they returned props.

Also accept: Putting the copy at the prop table meant the crew could check locations there instead of walking to the door.

Interpretation note: Accept a practical link between the nearby copy and checking locations. Do not add an unsupported claim that rehearsal became faster. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 8

Card 08 — Station Sign-Up

Revision focus: Explain how evidence supports a point

The science club had three build stations and eight learners. At first, two groups arrived at the same station while another was empty. Salma added a sign-up sheet with a group name beside each station and time slot. On the next round, each group went to the slot it had chosen. Student draft: “There were three stations and two marker colors.”

Task: Question: How did Salma’s sign-up sheet help the groups use the stations? Add an explanation that links a specific detail to the result.

One strong revision

The sheet linked group names to stations and time slots, so each group could see where to go on the next round instead of choosing the same station at once.

Why it improves the draft: The number of stations and marker colors do not explain how the crowding changed. The name-and-slot list connects each group’s choice to its next destination.

Also accept: Replace the marker-color claim: the sheet linked group names to stations and times, so groups knew which slot to use.

Also accept: The named station and time slots gave each group a destination; on the next round they followed those choices instead of gathering at one station.

Interpretation note: Accept a link between visible assignments and group destinations. Do not claim that the sheet eliminated every possible conflict. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 9

Card 09 — Heading Preference Check

Revision focus: Narrow a claim to match the evidence

One class tried two versions of a short club notice. Eight learners read both versions and marked which layout they preferred. Five chose the version with section headings, and three chose the version without them. No reading-speed measure was taken. Student draft: “Everyone reads faster when a notice has headings.”

Task: Question: What can the class report from this check? Rewrite the draft so the claim matches the evidence and include one accurate detail.

One strong revision

In this class check, five of eight learners preferred the notice with section headings. The check records a layout preference; it does not show that everyone reads faster.

Why it improves the draft: The evidence is a preference count from eight learners, not a speed measure or a result about all readers. The narrower sentence reports only what was observed.

Also accept: Five of eight learners preferred the headed notice in this check; reading speed was not measured.

Also accept: Most learners in this small check preferred headings, but a preference result does not show that everyone reads faster.

Interpretation note: Do not accept “faster” or “everyone”; neither is measured by the described check. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 10

Card 10 — Paper Glider Trial

Revision focus: Narrow a claim to match the evidence

For a paper-glider club trial, Noor folded a wider nose on one glider. In one toss of each design in the same hallway, the original traveled three meters and the revised one traveled four and a half meters. The group wrote down both distances but did not repeat the tosses. Student draft: “The wider fold makes any glider travel farther.”

Task: Question: What conclusion fits the trial described? Revise the draft to match the number and scope of the tests, using one measured detail.

One strong revision

In this single hallway trial, the glider with the wider nose traveled four and a half meters, compared with three meters for the original. More trials would be needed for a broader claim.

Why it improves the draft: The passage reports one toss of each design. Naming those distances keeps the claim tied to this trial instead of predicting what every glider will do.

Also accept: The revised glider went farther in this one test: 4.5 meters compared with 3 meters.

Also accept: The wider-nosed glider traveled 4.5 meters in its single toss, but one toss per design cannot show what any glider will do.

Interpretation note: Accept a conclusion about this trial. Do not require learners to design a full experiment or claim a cause beyond the comparison described. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 11

Card 11 — Garden Label Check

Revision focus: Narrow a claim to match the evidence

After the morning watering, a club checked five labels placed beside its garden beds. Four labels could still be read, and one had a blurred word. The group recorded this one check before deciding whether to change its marker.

Student draft: "Our labels never wash off."

Task: Question: What does this check show about the labels? Rewrite the draft so it matches the number of labels and the time observed.

One strong revision

After this morning's watering, four of the five checked labels were still readable. One check cannot support the claim that labels never wash off.

Why it improves the draft: The observation has a defined time and a group of five labels. Naming those limits replaces an absolute statement with the actual result.

Also accept: After this morning's watering, four of five labels were readable and one was blurred; this was only one check.

Also accept: In the one check after morning watering, most of the five labels were readable, which does not show they never blur.

Interpretation note: Do not accept "never" or a conclusion about all labels based on this one check. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 12

Card 12 — Four-Card Routine Trial

Revision focus: Narrow a claim to match the evidence

During one afternoon, eight groups tried a new routine that used four review cards. Six groups finished their chosen cards within ten minutes. The teacher recorded the time and asked groups to keep the same number of cards for the trial. Student draft: “This routine always saves every group time.”

Task: Question: What can the teacher conclude from this one trial? Narrow the draft and include the count or time that supports your revision.

One strong revision

In this afternoon’s trial, six of eight groups finished four chosen cards within ten minutes. The notes do not show that the routine always saves time for every group.

Why it improves the draft: The draft turns one observed session into an absolute claim. The count and time describe only that trial. No comparison with an earlier routine was recorded, so even this trial does not establish time saved.

Also accept: Six of eight groups completed four cards within ten minutes in this afternoon’s trial; that reports completion, not time saved.

Also accept: In this trial the routine took no more than ten minutes for most groups; without a comparison it does not show savings.

Interpretation note: Accept a scoped report of this trial. Do not claim that all groups always finish faster. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 13

Card 13 — The Family Fair Schedule

Revision focus: Remove or replace unsupported or off-topic material

The fair schedule listed a start time beside each activity and gave every activity a room name. Two families asked the organizer where the puppet show would be. The organizer added a room number next to that show. On the next visit, both families went to the listed room. Student draft: “The blue and gold schedule made everyone excited.”

Task: Question: What information helped families find the puppet show? Remove the unsupported idea and replace it with a detail that answers the question.

One strong revision

The schedule listed the puppet show’s room number beside its name, and both families went to that room on the next visit.

Why it improves the draft: Color and excitement are not supported as the reason families found the show. The room number is directly connected to the question and the families’ action.

Also accept: Replace the color and excitement claim with the room number next to the show, which told the families where to go.

Also accept: The listed room number guided both families to the puppet show on their next visit.

Interpretation note: Do not credit a claim about excitement or color as a cause; the scenario reports neither. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 14

Card 14 — Reading Nook Location

Revision focus: Remove or replace unsupported or off-topic material

The book club compared two places for its reading nook. The mural wall had bright paint, but there was no room to sit nearby. The quiet corner had three chairs and space to open books. The club chose the quiet corner so members could sit while they read together. Student draft: “They picked the nook because the mural was pretty and everyone liked it.”

Task: Question: Why did the club choose the quiet corner? Remove the unsupported reason and replace it with the detail that supports the decision.

One strong revision

The club chose the quiet corner because it had three chairs and room to open books, so members could sit together while reading.

Why it improves the draft: The draft gives a reason the passage does not report. The chairs and open space are stated features that match the club’s use for reading together.

Also accept: They chose the corner because members could sit there and open their books.

Also accept: Replace the mural claim with the three chairs and space for books, which made the corner suitable for reading together.

Interpretation note: Accept the stated seating and room. Do not infer that everyone liked the mural or that the club rejected its colors. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 15

Card 15 — Supply Map

Revision focus: Remove or replace unsupported or off-topic material

The art room stored glue, rulers, and scissors in three labeled bins. A small map by the doorway showed the bins and used arrows from the entrance. Before the map was posted, learners often asked where the scissors were. On the next work day, fewer learners asked. Student draft: “The map was put up on Friday because it was new.”

Task: Question: What feature of the map helped learners find the scissors? Remove the unrelated timing detail and use a detail that explains the result.

One strong revision

The map used arrows from the doorway to show where each labeled bin was, including the scissors. Fewer learners asked where they were on the next work day.

Why it improves the draft: The day the map was posted does not tell a reader how to find a supply. The arrows, labels, and observed change are relevant to the question.

Also accept: Replace the Friday claim with the arrows from the entrance toward the bins, which showed learners where to find the scissors.

Also accept: The map pointed learners toward the scissors bin; fewer learners asked where it was on the next work day, supporting its usefulness.

Interpretation note: Do not attribute the change to the posting day alone; the map feature is the relevant detail. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.

Explanatory key · Card 16

Card 16 — Ramp Test

Revision focus: Remove or replace unsupported or off-topic material

The makers' group rolled a wooden bead down a small model ramp. On the first try, the bead rolled off at the side. The group attached two low rails along the ramp. In the next try, the bead stayed on the ramp to the end. Student draft: "The purple paint looked exciting, so the rails were a great choice."

Task: Question: What test evidence supports the choice to add rails? Remove the unsupported paint comment and replace it with the before-and-after observations and what they show in this test.

One strong revision

The bead rolled off the side before the group added rails, then stayed on the ramp to the end on the next try. This comparison supports using rails to keep the bead on the path in this test.

Why it improves the draft: The before-and-after tests connect the rails with keeping the bead on the path. The passage does not report that the paint looked exciting or affected the result.

Also accept: Replace the paint claim: the bead rolled off before the rails, then stayed on the ramp afterward, supporting the rails in this test.

Also accept: The bead stayed on the ramp after rails were added, unlike the first try when it rolled off; this comparison supports the change in that test.

Interpretation note: Accept the two test observations and their sequence. Do not require a claim about how the rails would work on other ramps. Judge all three criteria using the complete submitted revision and explanation; these examples illustrate complete responses, while partial work earns only the criteria it meets.