

SESSION ONE

FOR TEACHERS ONLY

The University of the State of New York
REGENTS HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION

ENGLISH

E

Tuesday, August 13, 2002—8:30 to 11:30 a.m., only

SCORING KEY AND RATING GUIDE

Mechanics of Rating

The following procedures are to be used for rating papers in the Comprehensive Examination in English. More detailed directions for the organization of the rating process and procedures for rating the examination are included in the *Information Booklet for Administering and Scoring the Comprehensive Examination in English*.

Scoring of Multiple-Choice Questions

Indicate by means of a checkmark each incorrect or omitted answer to multiple-choice questions on the Session One answer sheet; do not place a checkmark beside a correct answer. Use only red ink or red pencil. In the box provided under each part, record the number of questions the student answered correctly for that part. Transfer the number of correct answers for the Part A and Part B multiple-choice questions to the appropriate spaces in the box in the upper right corner of each student's **SESSION ONE** answer sheet.

Session One	
Correct Answers	
Part A	Part B
(1) 4	(7) 1
(2) 1	(8) 2
(3) 3	(9) 4
(4) 2	(10) 3
(5) 1	(11) 4
(6) 4	(12) 1
	(13) 3
	(14) 2
	(15) 3
	(16) 4

Rating of Essays

- (1) Follow your school's procedures for training for rating. This process should include:

Introduction to the task—

- Raters read the task and summarize its purpose, audience, and format
- Raters read passage(s) and plan own response to task
- Raters share response plans and summarize expectations for student responses

Introduction to the rubric and anchor papers—

- Trainer reviews rubric with reference to the task
- Trainer reviews procedures for assigning scores
- Trainer leads review of each anchor paper and commentary
(**Note:** Anchor papers are ordered from high to low within each score level.)

Practice scoring individually—

- Raters score a set of five papers individually
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel confident enough to move on to actual scoring

- (2) When actual rating begins, each rater should record his or her individual rating for a student's essay on the rating sheet provided, *not* directly on the student's essay or answer sheet. Do *not* correct the student's work by making insertions or changes of any kind.
- (3) Each essay must be rated by at least two raters; a third rater will be necessary to resolve scores that differ by more than one point. The scoring coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the movement of papers, calculating a final score for each student's essay, and recording that information on the student's answer paper for Session One.

**SESSION ONE – PART A – SCORING RUBRIC
LISTENING AND WRITING FOR INFORMATION AND UNDERSTANDING**

QUALITY	6 Responses at this level:	5 Responses at this level:	4 Responses at this level:	3 Responses at this level:	2 Responses at this level:	1 Responses at this level:
<p>Meaning: the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding, interpretation, and analysis of the task and text(s)</p>	<p>-reveal an in-depth analysis of the text -make insightful connections between information and ideas in the text and the assigned task</p>	<p>-convey a thorough understanding of the text -make clear and explicit connections between information and ideas in the text and the assigned task</p>	<p>-convey a basic understanding of the text -make implicit connections between information and ideas in the text and the assigned task</p>	<p>-convey a basic understanding of the text -make few or superficial connections between information and ideas in the text and the assigned task</p>	<p>-convey a confused or inaccurate understanding of the text -allude to the text but make unclear or unwarranted connections to the assigned task</p>	<p>-provide minimal or no evidence of textual understanding -make no connections between information in the text and the assigned task</p>
<p>Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the text(s)</p>	<p>-develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific details from the text</p>	<p>-develop ideas clearly and consistently, using relevant and specific details from the text</p>	<p>-develop some ideas more fully than others, using specific and relevant details from the text</p>	<p>-develop ideas briefly, using some details from the text</p>	<p>-are incomplete or largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the text are vague, irrelevant, repetitive, or unjustified</p>	<p>-are minimal, with no evidence of development</p>
<p>Organization: the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence</p>	<p>-maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical and coherent structure through skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions</p>	<p>-maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through use of appropriate devices and transitions</p>	<p>-maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas but may lack internal consistency</p>	<p>-establish, but fail to maintain, an appropriate focus -exhibit a rudimentary structure but may include some inconsistencies or irrelevancies</p>	<p>-lack an appropriate focus but suggest some organization, or suggest a focus but lack organization</p>	<p>-show no focus or organization</p>
<p>Language Use: the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety</p>	<p>-are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning</p>	<p>-use language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing</p>	<p>-use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose -occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length</p>	<p>-rely on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose -exhibit some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success</p>	<p>-use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose -reveal little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect</p>	<p>-are minimal -use language that is incoherent or inappropriate</p>
<p>Conventions: the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and usage</p>	<p>-demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language</p>	<p>-demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language</p>	<p>-demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension</p>	<p>-demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension</p>	<p>-demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult</p>	<p>-are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable -may be illegible or not recognizable as English</p>

- If the student writes only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s), the response can be scored no higher than a 1.
- Responses totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be given a 0.
- A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.

World War I was a devastating conflict. But an even more insidious killer at work during that war was the influenza virus. The flu epidemic that raged concurrently with World War I resulted in the death of 550,000 Americans, more Americans than those who died in combat in all the wars of the twentieth century combined! Worldwide, the death toll exceeded 30 million. While the epidemic may appear to have outdistanced the war in terms of human destruction, it was the war that fueled the epidemic; it was the troops, their travel, and the change in lifestyle of civilians that empowered the virus, just as surely as the lethal weapons of today empower our military.

The influenza virus of 1918 probably originated at Fort Riley, Kansas, when soldiers buried tons of manure that sprung. Particles from this incineration became airborne in a duststorm and reportedly infected the first victims. Subsequently, with a cough or a sneeze, these soldiers infected others exponentially, living as they did in close quarters. Inevitably, infected soldiers crossed the Atlantic and the virus surfaced in Europe.

Many factors made this flu particularly virulent. First of all, this flu turned into pneumonia, and killed many, many people. Additionally, victims who ~~would normally~~ ^{would} have been quarantined were moved because of the war effort. Even when the scope of the epidemic became obvious, our leaders still chose to send troops overseas to reinforce depleted units. Their journey in infected troop ships and their arrival at infected bases killed thousands of young men.

Stateside, steps taken to contain the epidemic proved fruitless. Lawmakers made wearing face masks in public places mandatory, but the microbes could easily pass through the porous cloth. Biochemists worked to develop a vaccine, but were not able to identify the appropriate cause, a virus. Meanwhile, a population involved in a war continued to gather in masses for rallies, bond drives, and parades. The virus flourished.

On the month of September, 1918, 12,000 Americans died of influenza. In New York, 851 people died of the flu in a single day! In 31 days, the flu killed 195,000 Americans. It must have seemed that

between the war and the flu, civilization would never survive.

Then a miraculous thing took place: the epidemic slowly began to recede. When the Armistice ended the war on November 11, the worst of the epidemic had passed. The disease that had flourished because of the war also died with its end.

Anchor Level 6 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Reveals an in-depth analysis of the text, identifying the influenza virus as an <i>insidious killer</i> and discussing the various ways the virus was <i>empowered</i> by World War I. Connections made to the task are insightful (<i>it was the war that fueled the epidemic, soldiers crossed the Atlantic and the virus surfaced in Europe, our leaders still chose to send troops overseas, a population involved in a war continued to gather in masses</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, using relevant details from the text to discuss the origin and spread of the virus, what made it <i>particularly virulent</i>, the <i>steps taken to contain the epidemic</i>, and the numbers of fatalities (<i>It must have seemed that between the war and the flu, civilization would never survive</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the <i>flu epidemic that raged concurrently with World War I</i> and the wartime activities that encouraged the virus to flourish. The response demonstrates a logical structure, introducing the epidemic in relation to the war, then discussing the origin, nature, and scope of the virus in that context, making skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions (<i>Subsequently, exponentially, Inevitably, Meanwhile, Then</i>). The conclusion effectively summarizes the response's position.</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging (<i>reinforce depleted units</i>) with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose (<i>just as surely as the lethal weapons of today empower our military</i>). The response varies sentence length and structure to enhance meaning (<i>Their journey in infected troop ships and their arrival at infected bases killed thousands of young men</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions with essentially no errors.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6 in all qualities.</p>	

Throughout history mankind has been subject to the assault of disease. On occasion, man has been the unwitting accomplice of malignant microbes. Such was the case with the Black Plague of the seventeenth century and more recently the influenza epidemic of the early twentieth century.

Concentrating on the fortunes of war abroad (World War I) American civilians were unwittingly subjected to an assault at home for which they were woefully unprepared. At a Kansas military post, a seemingly innocuous act of waste disposal, the burning of manure, resulted in the wind-aided dispersal of a virulent strain of influenza. Shortly thereafter, young soldiers began to show up at the infirmary exhibiting fever, sore throat, headache; nothing serious. But it was serious as many died.

As part of the war effort, soldiers from this base in Kansas were shipped overseas and so was the influenza.

Not only was the flu following the soldiers, it was spread wherever groups of unsuspecting Americans gathered. The very parades and rallies that brought people together to support the war effort spread the contagion.

Even those depended upon for care and cure were ineffective. The doctors sorely needed at home were also needed abroad and were shipped to Europe to treat the wounded. Scientists searching

for a cure were hampered by a misunderstanding of the cause of influenza. Thinking it a bacterial infection, they created a vaccine, but this did no good against the flu virus. Stop-gap measures such as the wearing of surgical masks did nothing to contain the virus. One practice that might have helped ~~not~~ would have been quarantine, but in this time of war the populace was needed either in the factories or at the front. Where they went, the virus went also. People gathered and people died 550,000 of them.

Ironically, with the end of the war came the end of the influenza epidemic. The virus which had ravaged the country miraculously abated. Let us hope that the twenty-first century finds us, if not wiser, at least more cautious.

Anchor Level 6 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Reveals an in-depth analysis of the text, explaining that while <i>concentrating on the fortunes of war abroad</i> , Americans left themselves unprepared for the <i>assault at home</i> to which they were subjected. The response makes insightful connections to the task, describing the flu as <i>following the soldiers</i> , parades and rallies as events that <i>spread the contagion</i> , and the practice of quarantine as <i>impractical in this time of war</i> .
Development	Develops ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of details from the text to discuss the path of the epidemic from its start (<i>a seemingly innocuous act of waste disposal</i>) to its end (<i>The virus which had ravaged the country miraculously abated</i>) in light of the war as a contributing cause (<i>People gathered and people died 550,000 of them</i>).
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the ways World War I served as an <i>unwitting accomplice</i> to the influenza epidemic and exhibits a logical and coherent structure. Each paragraph synthesizes key ideas from the text, smoothly connected through the skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions (<i>On occasion, Shortly thereafter, Ironically</i>).
Language Use	Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging (<i>malignant microbes and wind-aided dispersal</i>) with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose. The response varies sentence length and structure to enhance meaning (<i>As part of the war effort, soldiers from this base in Kansas were shipped overseas and so was the influenza</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting only occasional errors in punctuation (<i>People died 550,000</i>).
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.	

The influenza epidemic of 1918 was both serious and in most cases lethal to those infected. One of the major causes can be attributed to World War I. 1918 was the final year of the Great War. Soldiers were being shipped to Europe daily. Back home, people worked long hours in the factories, then gathered at rallies to support the war effort. Under these conditions, any airborne pathogen is easy to spread. In this case, a deadly influenza.

The epidemic was thought to have started in Fort Riley, Kansas, where soldiers had burned tons of manure. On March 11, two days after the flaming fecal matter became airborne dust particles, an unsuspecting Army private came to the infirmary with a headache, sore throat, and fever. Shortly after, another case arrived. By noon, over 100 men showed symptoms. Army doctors more than likely told them to walk it off, believing it to be the common flu. When 48 men died, the cause was suspected to be pneumonia.

Shortly after this, 1.5 million soldiers were sent to Europe to fight in the war. Some of them were doubtlessly from Kansas. Soon the disease began claiming victims in Europe. After much investigation, the ailment was deemed to be the mutated form of ~~influenza~~ Influenza, deadly in the majority of cases.

This mutated old virus was now a worldwide killing machine. It could be passed by simply walking into a room with an infected individual in it. Normal protocol would have been to quarantine all carriers. However, a war was on. Many doctors

and nurses who could have been treating the sick at home were away in Europe. Doctors knew their test, but were stretched to the limit. They ~~to~~ tried to develop ~~out~~ a vaccine, but could not identify the infection as a virus. With no preventative techniques, some 12,000 Americans died in the month of September alone.

One strong indicator that the war was at least partly at fault for the epidemic was that the average age of the victims was between 21-29. The age span directly corresponded with the age of soldiers. Over 70,000 soldiers were infected, and some units lost 80% of their men to influenza. At home, the decision fell to President Wilson: Quarantine the troops, or keep the war effort moving? He chose to continue to send troops abroad, so the epidemic raged on.

Back in New York, 851 people died in the span of one day. In 31 days, the tally jumped to 195,000 dead. Then the war ended, and the epidemic tapered off. The virus had run out of susceptible candidates. In San Francisco, some 30,000 paraded through the streets to celebrate the end of the war with masks on. The masks would not have prevented the spread of the virus, but the close of the war marked the eminent end of the epidemic.

Anchor Level 5 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a thorough understanding of the text, describing the influenza epidemic as being supported by WWI. The response makes clear and explicit connections to the task, citing the war as <i>one of the major causes</i> of the epidemic and describing the war time activities as <i>conditions</i> under which <i>any airborne pathogen is easy to spread</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, effectively using relevant details from the text to describe the start of the epidemic (<i>By noon, over 100 men showed symptoms</i>), its spread into Europe, and the number of military and civilian fatalities. However, <i>long hours in the factories, rallies to support the war effort</i>, and how the virus <i>could be passed by simply walking into a room</i> are not elaborated. The assertion that the virus was <i>deadly in the majority of cases</i> is unjustified by the text.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on ways World War I contributed to the influenza epidemic. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure with each paragraph exploring a key idea from the text and is effectively linked through the use of transitions (<i>Back home, shortly after, Back in New York</i>). However, the introduction of new ideas renders the conclusion less effective.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>airborne pathogen, unsuspecting Army private, doubtlessly from Kansas</i>) with an evident awareness of audiences and purpose. The response attempts to vary sentence length and structure to enhance meaning (<i>Normal protocol would have been to quarantine all carriers. However, a war was on</i>), though occasional errors result (<i>In this case, a deadly influenza</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in capitalization.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is slightly weaker in development and organization.</p>	

In 1918, World War I was raging, and Americans were joining the effort in earnest. It was this war that caused one of the deadliest epidemics in history to spread throughout the world. It all started in our country.

Millions died. This, and the information to follow, was supplied by an account ~~made~~ from David McCullough.

Soldiers stationed in Fort Riley, Kansas, were the first to exhibit symptoms of this mysterious disease. After ~~burning~~ burning manure, soldiers began to feel ill with a flu. Cases

multiplied, until 500 men were laid low at that base. Forty-eight of them died.

Considered the "Kansas sickness", the malady was given little regard.

However, as soldiers were shipped across the Atlantic, the "Kansas sickness" showed up in Europe.

French, English, German, and American soldiers became infected. ~~So were~~

~~it~~ Likewise civilians; no one was spared.

Identified as influenza, this strain did not match the typical profile. This virus killed relentlessly; it went

from a fever to a flu to pneumonia, the medical community, ~~stressed~~ stressed from the war-effort, ~~was~~ was unable to develop a cure.

In fact, the war itself was a nearly perfect means of spreading the disease, being air-borne, this flu spread like wide fire as thousands packed the streets for parades, to raise morale. It spread through factories ~~to~~ where employees worked in crowded conditions to meet the stepped-up demand for supplies. It spread through troop ships, where soldiers travelled in the closest conditions possible. It devastated communities and military bases, at home and abroad. Laws to contain it were passed in futility. Thousands of young soldiers and healthy citizens died.

When the war finally ended, miraculously, the flu began to dissipate. The infection receded as the public lost reason to gather in such large amounts, and troops stopped their world-wide travelling. In all, the flu had claimed thirty million lives.

Five hundred and fifty thousand
 were Americans,

Had there been no war,
 this ~~epi~~ epidemic would not have
 effected so many. However, there
 was the war, so the people of that era
 suffered devastating losses, not just
 through human actions, but also
 through the action of a tiny
 virus that no human could control.

Anchor Level 5 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a thorough understanding of the text and makes clear and explicit connections to the task, identifying World War I as the <i>war that caused one of the deadliest epidemics in history</i> and discussing ways the <i>war itself was a nearly perfect means of spreading the disease</i> (infected soldiers traveling to Europe, <i>The medical community ... was unable to develop a cure</i>, the virus was transmitted rapidly through air).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, using relevant and specific details from the text to elaborate on the origin of the virus (<i>the “Kansas sickness”</i>), its symptoms, how it was transmitted (<i>Being air-borne, this flu spread like wide fire</i>), and enumerating the fatalities nationally and worldwide.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus, arguing that World War I contributed greatly to the influenza epidemic. Ideas are chronologically sequenced from the start of the epidemic to <i>when the war finally ended...the flu began to dissipate</i>, using appropriate transitions throughout. The summarizing conclusion effectively juxtaposes the devastation caused <i>through human actions</i> with the <i>action of a tiny virus that no human could control</i>.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>match the typical profile, killed relentlessly, passed in futility</i>) with an evident awareness of audience and purpose. The response varies sentence structure and length to control rhythm and pacing and, occasionally, to enhance meaning, as shown in the parallel structures of paragraph 4.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>reguard, dissipate, effected</i> for “affected”) and punctuation (comma and semicolon use) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

World War I had many effects on American citizens as well as citizens throughout the world. Although we focus on the positive effects most of the time, there was a negative effect of the war on citizens. World War I may have contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic of 1918.

During Spring of 1918, the US was focused on winning World War I. We had the notion that America, our home, was safe; the only thing to fear was the war abroad. Unfortunately, this was not true. According to David McCullough, soldiers at a fort in Kansas may have started the epidemic by burning manure, which was then carried through the air by a gale and spread the beginning of the disease. Two days later, on March 11, a soldier there reported to the camp hospital. ~~By the end of the day,~~ By noon, 100 cases were reported of what was labeled "pneumonia". It caused 500 soldiers to report sick by the end of the week and killed 48 that spring. If the war had not existed, there is a possibility that less people would have been in the area, in effect less may have been infected, and that the soldiers stationed there may have stayed there until the disease wore itself out. Unfortunately, soon after the breakout, 1.5 million American soldiers, including some of those from Kansas, were sent to Europe to go to war. This allowed any soldiers exposed to the infected to become sick and spread the disease to European soldiers. The disease was now being spread across the world. Even worse, the microbes were airborne, causing it to spread even faster.

Back at home, Americans were parading through streets together in throngs, leading to a spread of the virus. Despite efforts to contain it by closing down schools and forcing people to wear masks, the virus continued to spread.

By the time the armistice was signed on November 11, the epidemic began to die down. The casualties due to the epidemic, over 550,000, ~~was~~ far exceeded the American casualties of all the wars of that century combined. Because of the war and the dedication Americans had to winning that war, influenza was spread throughout the world killing 30 million people and infecting nearly every person on earth. If it had not been for the war, we would've only had a small outbreak in Kansas, or even no outbreak at all.

Anchor Level 5 – C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a thorough understanding of the text, describing the influenza epidemic as a <i>negative effect of the war</i> that started <i>at a fort in Kansas</i> and <i>spread throughout the world</i> . Connections to the task are generally explicit (<i>If the war had not existed</i> and <i>Because of the war</i>) although occasionally implicit (<i>This allowed any soldiers exposed</i>).
Development	Clearly and consistently develops ideas (the start of the epidemic, its spread, the number of fatalities), using relevant details from the text. Less well developed are <i>the microbes were airborne, Americans were parading through streets together, and efforts to contain the virus</i> .
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the task (<i>World War I may have contributed</i>) and exhibits a logical sequence of ideas (U.S. involvement in the war, the start of the epidemic, the spread to Europe, the virus at home, the end of the war and epidemic). Organization is less consistent in paragraph 2, which combines some loosely connected ideas, and in the conclusion, which repeats some ideas from paragraph 2.
Language Use	Uses language that is generally appropriate, sometimes fluent (<i>The microbes were airborne</i>), but sometimes imprecise (<i>burning manure, which was then carried through the air by a gale and spread the beginning of the disease and breakout</i>) with an evident awareness of audience and purpose. The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure (<i>The casualties due to the epidemic, over 550,000, far exceeded the American casualties of all the wars of that century combined</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>pnemonia</i> and <i>microbs</i>), comma use, and pronoun reference.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.	

The spread of the influenza epidemic across the world would have been partly due to WWI in 1918.

It is believed to have been started in Fort Riley, Kansas. Soldiers were burning tons of manure when a strong wind came and spread dust across the land. Two days later is when the first soldier reported severe cold symptoms. Hundreds more followed within the next week. The sickness, which later ^{was} ~~later~~ discovered to be influenza or the flu, spread rapidly. Soldiers from Fort Riley were sent to Europe to fight. In Europe more soldiers both American and European reported ~~symptoms~~ ^{became ill from} the flu similar to the cases reported in Kansas. One reason the flu was spread through the soldiers was the troop shipments. Living quarters on the ships were very tight so germs were able to be spread easily and quickly. Even after millions of people fell victim to the flu and were killed by it, President Woodrow Wilson would not stop troop shipments as the spread of the disease continued.

Although an epidemic such as this deadly form of influenza would normally cause things to slow down or come to a halt completely, they did not. Everything should have shut down until the disease was brought under

control but that could not be done. This was due to the War. Bond drives had to continue collecting money, factories had to continue to make supplies; so germs continued to spread. ~~at~~ ~~people~~ ~~as~~ ~~people~~ The virus was spread through the air by tiny particles so all this activity made thousands or even millions of people susceptible to become ill.

Officials tried to make laws requiring people to wear masks but they did not help. The virus ~~can~~ ^{could} easily pass right through them. The war caused patriotic people to hold public gatherings. Some of them were huge. In Philadelphia 200,000 people crowded in the streets at one time. Little did they know that a cough from one person sent millions of tiny particles through the air easily infecting many people. This deadly virus was carried and spread ~~by~~ ^{to other} people simply by breathing. The war ~~is~~

WWI increased people's exposure to the deadly influenza virus. Troops in ships being sent to Europe, then traveling from base to base spread the disease to millions. Factories and war benefits could not be stopped, and public gatherings continued due to the war and that is

~~one~~ why the influenza outbreak was so severe and spread across America and Europe.

Anchor Level 4 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the text and task, citing ways the spread of <i>the influenza epidemic ... could have been partly due to WWI</i> (movement of soldiers, <i>Living quarters on the ships</i> , public gatherings, factory work).
Development	Develops some ideas more clearly than others. The response explains the spread of the virus by soldiers and its spread through civilian gatherings at home, using relevant details from the text. However, attempts to stop the spread of the virus are only mentioned and the scope of fatalities is not addressed.
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on ways World War I contributed to the epidemic and exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, using appropriate transitions between and within paragraphs (<i>It is believed to have been, Even after millions of people, Although an epidemic such as this</i>). The concluding paragraph effectively summarizes the response.
Language Use	Uses language that is appropriate (<i>Hundreds more followed, both American and European, millions of people fell victim</i>) with awareness of audience and purpose. Attempts to use effective sentence structure are occasionally successful. However, errors in construction frequently result in confusion (<i>The virus was spread through the air by tiny particles so all this activity made thousands or even millions of people suseptable to become ill</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>hault, suseptable, patriatic</i>), punctuation (<i>peoples</i> and comma use), grammar (pronoun reference), and proofreading (<i>similar</i> repeated, <i>tha, simple</i> for “simply”) that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.	

World War I was overall a great success for America and our allies. It was a success because we had won the war in Europe but there was also a war going on at home. The war at home was a different kind of war. It was against a virus that was spreading rapidly and killing Americans. World War I only contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic.

The epidemic was believed to have been started at an army fort in Kansas. It was started when the soldiers there were burning manure and it was tipped over causing a cloud of dust to arise into the air. One week after that there were five hundred soldiers in the hospital with flu-like symptoms. In addition to that forty-eight soldiers were dead from what they believed was pneumonia. Despite this the U.S. was still sending troops over to Europe. They sent the troops on troop ships, which were very crowded, and the disease could easily be spread.

After they arrived in Europe the disease continued to spread. Soon English and French troops also had the disease. While in Europe the virus mutated and became more deadly. As soldiers kept moving from base to base the disease grew more and more. In some cases the disease wiped out nearly 80% of soldiers at a base.

The mutated and more deadly virus came to the United States. There were large gatherings of people in cities to support the war that only spread the disease more. The disease just kept on spreading and killing more Americans. Laws were passed telling people to

wear masks but the masks didn't help because the tiny influenza microbes could penetrate it. There was no solution to this national epidemic. Scientists tried to come up with a vaccine for it but couldn't because it was caused by a virus.

As the war began to end so did the epidemic. It ran out of people for it to affect. Although the epidemic had ended it already had done its damage. It ended up killing over 550,000 Americans in just 10 months. There is no doubt in my mind that if we weren't involved in the war the epidemic would not have occurred. It was because of America's tunnel vision towards the war that the epidemic became so bad.

Anchor Level 4 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the text, describing the epidemic as <i>a war going on at home</i>, and addressing both the world-wide and national spread of the virus in relation to World War I. Connections made to the task are implicit (<i>They sent the troops on troop ships, which were very crowded</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response explains the start of the epidemic, using relevant details from the text, although some details are misinterpreted (<i>it was tipped over causing a cloud of dust</i>). Other ideas are discussed as generalities (<i>Soon English and French troops also had the disease and The mutated and more deadly virus came to the United States</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on ways <i>World War I ... contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic</i>. Ideas are generally logically sequenced; however, some ideas within paragraphs are combined without transitions (<i>the virus mutated and soldiers kept moving</i>), creating internal inconsistencies. The final statement of the conclusion appears out of context and is unsupported by the previous paragraphs.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate, although sometimes basic (<i>They sent the troops on troop ships</i>) or imprecise (<i>Laws were based</i>). The response consists largely of short sentences with little success in its few attempts to vary sentence length and structure (<i>There were large gatherings of people in cities to support the war that only spread the disease more</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>sucess, manuer, namonia, occured</i>), punctuation (<i>it's damage</i> and comma usage), grammar (pronoun reference and agreement), and proofreading (<i>to repeated</i> and <i>based telling</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.</p>	

Some people back in 1918 thought the flu was just a severe cold, but when hundreds of people began dying they knew there was a lot more to it.

During the last year of world war I, a deadly case of influenza swept over Europe and America. Some say the epidemic started in the spring when soldiers burned tons of manure in Fort Riley, Kansas. The people thought it was just the common flu, especially when an army private came down with the normal symptoms - fever, headache, sore throat. No big deal. In a week, there were five hundred cases of the flu and forty-eight soldiers had died from pneumonia at Fort Riley. Two very crucial things were going on at once. The war, which demanded everything to speed up and the influenza epidemic, which demanded for everything to be shut down. For the cause of the war, soldiers needed to be put on boats to cross the Atlantic for war. But the soldiers were carrying it from one military base to the next. Just one cough carried millions of particles with the virus. Sending troops across the Atlantic caused the virus to spread to the English and French soldiers and eventually back to America. Hospitals overflowed and every available nurse and doctor was sent to Europe. Laws required people to wear masks in public, but that was pointless because the masks were thin and allowed the virus to pass through. In Washington, D.C., the commander banned city gatherings, closed schools and bars, but the death rate kept rising. Bio-chemists tried to create a vaccine.

The attempt to provide a cure failed. In September, 12,000 Americans died. People aged 21-29 were most vulnerable, including soldiers. 70,000 American soldiers were sick. Eighty percent of soldiers died in some units. President Woodrow Wilson knew that if he continued to send troops on ships, it ~~will~~ kill so many more people, but he needed to send them to fight the war. In just 31 days, 195,000 people died from the flu. Then, by a miracle, on November 11, the Armistice ended the war. The epidemic was passing. 550,000 people died in ten months. That's larger than the number of people that had died in combat in all the wars in the 20th Century.

This epidemic infected the majority of the human species. I believe that if it weren't for the war going on at the same time, there would have been a lot less people that have died.

Anchor Level 4 – C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the text, discussing the cause of the influenza epidemic in the context of World War I, including the initial appearance of symptoms at Fort Riley, the transporting of infected troops, the futile <i>attempt to provide a cure</i>, and the <i>passing</i> of the epidemic coinciding with the armistice. Connections to the task are generally implicit, although some explicit connections are made (<i>Sending troops across the Atlantic caused the virus to spread</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops some ideas (the spread of the flu by soldiers, attempts made to contain the disease, the number of lives the flu affected), using specific details from the text. However, President Wilson’s decision is not well explained and how the disease was spread among civilians is not addressed. The statement <i>every available nurse and doctor was sent to Europe</i> is inaccurate.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the <i>deadly case of influenza, which swept over Europe and America</i> during the war. The response contains an introduction and summarizing conclusion and generally exhibits a logical flow of ideas. However, the lengthy body paragraph lacks appropriate internal transitions, resulting in some internal inconsistency.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate, although the occasional use of informal language detracts somewhat from the sense of audience (<i>No big deal</i>). The response relies on simple sentences, exhibiting uneven success in attempts to vary sentence structure for effect.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>armistace</i>), punctuation (comma omission), paragraphing, grammar, and usage (<i>people that, would have been a lot less that have</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.</p>	

The influenza epidemic of 1918 spread and killed many innocent with the help of the United States efforts in World War I.

The disease itself was not caused by the War. It began when Fort Riley, located in Kansas began burning piles manure. The wind picked up and carried the smoke into a choking dust storm over the lands. A couple days later more than 100 people were diagnosed with symptoms that started out like pneumonia and then influenza. The War began to spread the influenza that summer the US sent more than a million troops across the Atlantic for war, even some troops that had come from Kansas. When troops were sent over seas, many were confined to small quarters.

Another way the War helped spread the disease were bond parades. During the time of war, cities and towns gathered for parades to raise and gather money toward the war effort. These were bad merely because thousands of people gathered in crowded streets and helped spread the disease further. One final example is how war demanded everything be running. In times of War business needed to be pumping out products twice as fast. This caused people to do the same, working

twice as fast and twice as much. People couldn't work twice as much and fight a disease.

Whether or not the War began the disease, it did contribute to the spread and destruction of it. Business would not have been booming and troops would not have had to die crossing the ocean if it hadn't been for the War.

Anchor Level 3 – A

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Conveys a basic understanding of the text (<i>The disease itself was not caused by the War and The War began to spread the influenza</i>). Connections to the task are superficial (<i>These were bad merely because thousands of people gathered in crowded streets and People couldn't work twice as much and fight a disease</i>).
Development	Briefly develops how the disease began, was carried by troops, and spread rapidly at home, using some details from the text (<i>the wind ... carried the smoke into a choking dustorm, many were confined to small quarters, business needed to be pumping out products</i>).
Organization	Establishes a clear and appropriate focus on ways <i>the United States efforts in World War I</i> contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic. The response follows a logical sequence with appropriate transitions between paragraphs. However, the flow of ideas is disrupted with the introduction of <i>one final example</i> in paragraph 3, and the conclusion is somewhat inconsistent.
Language Use	Uses language that is basic (<i>across the Atlantic for war, During the time of war, money toward the war effort, everything be running</i>) and occasionally imprecise (<i>started out like pneumonia and then influenza</i>). The response attempts to vary sentence structure with uneven success (<i>It began when Fort Riley located in Kansas began burning piles manuer</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting errors in spelling (<i>manuer</i> and <i>Atlanta</i> for "Atlantic"), punctuation (<i>influenza that summer</i>), grammar (<i>Another way ... were</i>), and word omission (<i>piles manuer</i> and <i>spread and killed many innocent with</i>) that hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in organization.	

In 1918, World War One was under way. Countries were heavily focused on the war effort. But out of view, a hidden enemy made its move.

In Fort Riley, Kansas, 100 soldiers complained about fever & headaches. Shortly after that, 500 soldiers shared the same symptoms. Some of these soldiers were sent off to the front lines. It was here that the contagion would spread, by breathing alone. A short while later, the same troubles arose in England, France & Germany. When our boys came home, the cause of their suffering was diagnosed as a simple flu. However, this flu was killing. 12,000 had already died. Mutations of this flu created a gateway for other diseases such as diphtheria.

With troops constantly being shipped out and imported, the mutated enemy was finding its way into the heart of the US.

Scientists were working up the clock trying to discover a cure for the flu. They thought it was a bacterial but it was a virus. Vaccines weren't working, and people were dying.

As the war came to an end when the Armistice was signed on November 11th, people celebrated this historic occasion, and coincidentally, the virus was ending its battle as well.

Fewer & fewer cases were arising. It had killed over 550,000 people.

World War I was ultimately the virus's ally as it allowed it to jump from continent to continent, spreading its fingers as far as possible, grabbing what ever it could.

Anchor Level 3 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Conveys a basic understanding of the text, stating that <i>World War I was ultimately the virus's ally</i> and providing some examples of how the two worked concurrently. The few connections made between the text and task are occasionally implicit (<i>the same troubles arose in England, France, & Germany</i>) and generally unclear (<i>With troops constantly being shipped out and imported, the mutated enemy was finding its way into the heart of the U.S.</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Briefly develops the ideas that the virus began and ended with the war and that American soldiers spread the disease to Europe. However, other ideas are merely hinted at (<i>Countries were heavily focused on the war effort</i>), and references to the text are vague or unclear (<i>12000 had already died</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes a focus on <i>a hidden enemy</i> and exhibits a rudimentary structure, including an introduction, three supporting paragraphs, and a somewhat overstated conclusion (<i>spreading its fingers as far as possible, grabbing what ever it could</i>). The paragraphs contain numerous inconsistencies, undermining cohesiveness.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate, occasionally fluent and original (<i>created a gateway</i>) or imprecise (<i>the contegent</i> and <i>working up</i>) with some awareness of audience and purpose. The response consists mostly of short sentences with little success in its attempt to vary sentence structure.</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>heavely, contegent, namonia, shiped, clossuer, grabing</i>), punctuation (<i>werent</i> and <i>it's battle</i>), and random capitalization that hinder comprehension somewhat.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in language use and conventions and weaker in development.</p>	

Influenza A sickness that spread rapidly during 1918 or World War I. "Influenza killed 550,000 Americans in 10 months. Most of the people affected were between the ages of 20 and 40 years old." Because of World War I a lot of soldiers got infected because they were in crowded places where the little particles of Influenza could infect other people, because if a sick person would cough or even breathe next to someone healthy that person would get sick because of the "air borne particles". The war was increasing the chance of exposure just by having sick people participate in the war along with healthy people. The troop ships were the ones that were infecting more people, because of the crowded space they had a lot of people who got influenza. Since there wasn't a vaccine for it yet people just kept dying. There was a bacteria which people thought might cure influenza but it actually didn't do anything. Then there were masks but those didn't work either. The tiny particles of influenza were so small that they could pass through the masks and into the people's systems just like if they weren't

wearing anything at all. It was quite sad. So, these people that got infected with influenza had no hope of surviving or how about the people who got infected because of carelessness of the Government, how did they feel? I don't know but I think that World War I is to be blamed for most of the spreading of influenza. It's like if they initiated the sickness.

Anchor Level 3 – C

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Conveys a basic understanding of the text, providing a discussion of the progression of the influenza epidemic of 1918. Connections to the task are unclear (<i>The troop ships were the one's that were inflecting more people and people who got infected because of carelessness of the Government</i>) or unwarranted (<i>people that got infected with influenza had no hope of surviving</i>).
Development	Develops ideas briefly. The response describes the transmission of the virus and some steps taken to halt the transmission, using some details from the text (<i>a sick person would cough or even breathe and so small that they could pass through the masks</i>) that are occasionally inaccurate (<i>a bacteria ... might cure</i>). However, key ideas (how the disease started, its spread through Europe, its spread among American civilians) are not addressed.
Organization	Attempts to establish a focus on how the war contributed to the epidemic but fails to maintain that focus. The single paragraph is a discussion of the spread of the disease and the attempts to contain it. The final two sentences attempt to return to the original focus. The personal observation used to conclude the paragraph is inconsistent with the overall response.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>a lot of soldiers, just like if, how about the people</i>) with little awareness of audience and purpose. The response exhibits some attempts to vary sentence length and structure, which occasionally result in run-on sentences.
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>vacine and surving</i>), punctuation (arbitrary use of quotation marks, <i>one's, peoples</i> , missing commas), paragraphing, and capitalization (<i>i</i>) that occasionally hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in development.	

The epidemic of 1918 was long and difficult time for people. This epidemic took a lot of people's life. Influenza is ~~dead~~ a virus which the symptoms were fever, sore throat and then eventually you would get pneumonia and die.

It was started by soldiers who was sent to burn munitions in Fort Riley Kansas what made this an even more horrible era was that that had no cure for the virus.

The virus was very much contagious also because most people would catch influenza and would think

its just a regular cold. then they would associate with people and more people would get infected. Most people age 21-29 were

the ~~most~~ frequent age. Over a 10 months a majority of 600 million

Anchor Level 2 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys an inaccurate understanding of the text and task, stating that the epidemic of 1918 was a <i>long and difficult time that took alot of peoples life</i> but failing to mention World War I as a contributing cause. The statement <i>it was started by soilders who was said to burn manuer in Fort Riley Kansas</i> is not connected to the task, and its meaning is unclear.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped. Although the response hints at some ideas from the text (<i>What made this an even more horrible era</i> and <i>Most people age 21-29 were the frequent age</i>), the role of World War I is not addressed, and references to the text are vague.</p>
Organization	<p>Lacks an appropriate focus but suggests some organization with separate paragraphs discussing the nature of the epidemic and how it was spread. The conclusion attempts to enumerate the scope of the epidemic but ends abruptly.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>cure for the virus</i> and <i>very much contagious</i>) and sentence structures that are generally flawed with some sentences nearly incoherent (<i>Influenza a viruses which the symptoms where fever, sore throat and then eventually you would get phenomonia and die</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>phenomonia, manuer, inrected</i>), capitalization (<i>Influenza</i>), punctuation (<i>peoples</i> and <i>Its</i>), and grammar (word omission and agreement), and usage (<i>alot</i> and <i>that</i> for “they”) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is slightly weaker in language use.</p>	

My Social Studies class has been studying world war I and its effects on civilians in America. I am going to discuss an account that I heard by David McCullough.

The war of 1918 was bad and all of our fears and anger was for Europe. But many of Americans were safe at home. And also the U.S. was leading the world. Many of the soldiers died from emphysema. I travelled through the air and there was nothing you could do.

Many people tried to wear gas masks but the stuff in the air went right through them. People said it was like trying to keep dust out with chicken wire. Nothing anyone could really do about this.

As time went on and the war ended, things slowly came back to normal.

Anchor Level 2 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys an inaccurate understanding of the text and task. The response attempts to describe the War of 1918 but makes no reference to the influenza epidemic, stating <i>many of Americans where safe at home</i>. The response misinterprets the task (<i>I am going to dicuse an account I heard by David McCollough</i>) and refers to face masks as <i>gas masks</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is largely underdeveloped. The response hints at a few ideas from the text (<i>the stuff in the air went right throught them</i> and <i>As ... the war ended. Thing slowly came back to normal</i>), but references to the text are vague and unjustified.</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on a text <i>that I heard by David McCollough</i> and suggests a rudimentary structure. However, the two paragraphs and conclusion provide a loose, inaccurate discussion of <i>the war of 1918</i> and do not support the focus stated in the introduction.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>war of 1918 was bad, many of Americans, Soldiers died from emnoy</i>) with some reliance on vocabulary from the task and text. Sentences are often flawed or ineffective, approaching incoherence (<i>I traviled throw the air and their was nothing you could do</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>dicuse, tords, Eurpoe, emnoy</i>), punctuation (missing commas), and grammar (use of the coordinating conjunction and subject/verb agreement) that make comprehension difficult.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.</p>	

World War I may have contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic of 1918. The war effort affected the epidemic by increasing the chance of exposure. The affected soldiers were sent to other camps. At the camps, other soldier began to be immune to the disease and its was spreaded to other soldiers. The laws was requiring people to wear the mask in public. Some people did not wanted to wear the mask. The influenza of 1918 occured primarily during the spring time. The troops ships were hazardous because of crowded quarters.

Anchor Level 2 – C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides minimal evidence of textual understanding, relying primarily on information copied from the task and multiple-choice questions, some of which is inaccurate. The two original sentences allude to the text but attempt a connection to the task that is unclear (<i>The affected soldiers were sent to other camps. At the camps, other soldier began to be immune to the disease and its was spreaded to other soldiers</i>).</p>
Development	Is largely undeveloped. The response consists of ideas extracted from the multiple-choice questions and restated without elaboration. The response briefly attempts to describe how soldiers infected other soldiers, but the explanation is incomplete.
Organization	Suggests a focus by re-stating the task, but the single paragraph contains several unconnected ideas, resulting in an overall lack of cohesion.
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise and repetitive (<i>began to be immune and spreaded to other soldiers</i>), relying mostly on vocabulary from the task and multiple-choice questions. Sentences reveal little awareness of the effective use of structure.
Conventions	Original content is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat weaker in meaning and conventions.</p>	

In 1918, the World War I happened. There were a lot of diseases, so the soldiers burned turn of something, kicked them up and swept out over the land. ^(at home safe)

It didn't have any doubtful disease that was going to be serious, because firstly people had just fever, sore throat and headache who had sickness. Nobody considered the sickness as going to make people die. There were about 100 cases, but after a week it increased 500 cases. It was becoming more deadly. Anyone had never seen this cases. ↵

In that time, some of people died, because of cancers sickness and the misterious sickness, the influenza epidemic.

To defend about spread of the influenza epidemic, people shot everything down and split to hospital over flow. Washington D.C Public gathering kepe rising and develop vaccine, but sometimes even vaccine didn't help them. Nobody had never seen bacteria eventually, but 500,000 people died in ten months and 30 million people died in the world.

Anchor Level 1 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides minimal evidence of textual understanding (<i>firstly people had just fever, sore throat, and headache; It was becoming more deadly; 30 milion people died in the world</i>). While the response alludes to World War I, no connections are made between the text and the assigned task.
Development	Is largely undeveloped. The response attempts to address the start of the epidemic and the effects on the civilian population; however, ideas from the text are merely hinted at (<i>the soldiers burned turn of something, kick them up and swept out over the land and people shut everything down and split to hospital over flow</i>), and references to the text are unjustified (<i>Nobody had never seen bacteria and 500,000 people died in ten months</i>).
Organization	Shows no focus. The response minimally suggests some organization by providing two paragraphs. However, the paragraphs lack cohesion.
Language Use	Uses language that is frequently incoherent (<i>It didn't have any doubtful disease; Anyone had never seen this cases; Washington D.C Public gathering kept rising and develop vaccine</i>).
Conventions	The response exhibits numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and usage, making comprehension extremely difficult.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is slightly stronger in development.	

My Social Studies class has been studying World War I and its effects on civilians in America. I am writing a position paper which I argue that World War I may have contributed to the spread of influenza epidemic of 1918.

In a way I don't think that World War I contributed to the spread of influenza because the soldiers brund maneuver. For what? Why did they do that, what was the reason? I don't think that the branding ad maneuver was part of the war.

The War is over, people are well because of the people are more educated.

Anchor Level 1 – B

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Provides minimal evidence of textual understanding, consisting of words copied directly from the situation and task with final sentences revealing a mostly personal response. No connections are made between the text and the task.
Development	Is minimal. The single reference to the text is misinterpreted (<i>In a way I don't think that World War I contributed to the spread of influenza because the soldiers brund maneuver</i>).
Organization	Shows no focus or organization. While the response is comprised of three paragraphs, ideas are random and unconnected.
Language Use	Is minimal, using some language copied from the task and situation. The remaining original language is at times inappropriate (<i>for what. Why did they do that, what was the reason</i>) or nearly incoherent (<i>People are well because of the people are more educated</i>).
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of the conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1 in all categories.	

During the last year of World War I, a new killer, more fearsome than any war of the century, was being bred. In the heart of the American nation, one simple, seemingly harmless, act was about to spread a plague. In the spring of 1918, soldiers at Fort Riley, Kansas embarked on a routine act — burning manure. However, as the fire gave off vicious toxins and the wind picked up, these oblivious soldiers were about to be the first victims of a new "world war." Perhaps the epidemic would not have been so deadly had it not been for one thing: World War I.

World War I gave this unique killer — ironically, the flu — just what it needed to "conquer the world," so to say. That is, it gave it transport. Just as transport ships and other vessels took soldiers from the isolated safety of America to the hostile warfront, so too did they carry the influenza. Because the illness was a unique version of the common flu, it also travelled as the common flu did — through airborne microorganisms. As a result of such a deadly, airborne virus, World War I would be perfect for spreading it.

Transport ships, alone, were enough to heighten the illness. Under such close quarters, an airborne illness simply thrived. Whatever one soldier came down with, every soldier on board would have within days. This is quite similar to the slave ships carrying Africans to the Americas to be sold as slaves before 1865.

Furthermore, once at the warfront, thousands of perfect victims were huddled together — young adult men. The virus quickly spread from soldier to soldier as orders were barked out, deep breaths were taken, and everyone struggled side by side.

On America's home turf, the epidemic was also spreading as a result of the great war. As battles were won and motivation raised, parades and other such public events were held to raise public morale and support. However, these pep rallies were no more than early death camps. In New York City, during another parade, more than 850 American civilians were terminated as a result of the horrible epidemic.

As the epidemic of 1918 began, there can be no doubt that the entire act of World War I gave rise to its power, ending the lives of many innocent American civilians. Because of such close quarters and public affairs, this airborne menace was allowed to wage its own war.

In 1918 soldiers at Fort Riley Kansas became suddenly ill. All of the soldiers symptoms were the same. WWI contributed or might have contributed to the spread of Influenza in 1918. These ways are numerous. ~~But~~ Even though the war was in Europe its effect is felt in ~~America~~ the U.S. by different means.

In the spring of 1918 in Fort Riley 48 soldiers died from influenza. Influenza ~~was~~ usually affects the weak but for some reason targeted ~~people~~ ^{people} in their prime ages 21 to 29. WWI helped contribute to the spread of Influenza by rationing food to the civilians to help feed the soldiers. WWI also contributed by weakening the soldiers who first contracted Influenza then transferring it to other people.

Drastic measures were taken to stop the spread of influenza. Officials rushed to create laws forcing people to ~~make~~ wear masks in public. In some places governors even used all the power they had to quarantine the sick, shut down schools, and stopped public gatherings. Influenza is spread threw the air so the masks didn't help. It rushed threw out the globe killing many people. "In the ~~the~~ army as much as 80% of the men died in some of the units". General Pershing ordered for reinforcements. Wilson agreed and shipping men on troop boats continued with the cramped quarters.

Biochemists tried to find a vaccine but they didn't help. Influenza is a virus, not a bacteria. "An Estimated of 550,000 Americans died in New York in 10 months" "851 in one day" Soldiers spread the disease between bases then to other soldiers. Influenza killed millions across the globe. On November 11 WWI was over.

Part A — Practice Paper – B

WNI contributed to the spread of Influenza by contracting it because the weak and the wounded men got it easily then spread it to the community which was weak through the rationing of food and the lack of doctors.

In the spring of 1918, the U.S. was fighting World War I. A contagious epidemic began to spread throughout America. It is said to have been started when manure had been burned in Fort Riley, Kansas on March 9th. Within a week, there were 500 cases of this epidemic. Influenza^(the flu) is what it was that was making these people sick. The flu would turn to pneumonia and would become a relentless killer. That spring, 48 army soldiers died from this. Because this epidemic was so easily spread, it would be safer to shut everything down and not have people around other people as much. However, with the war going on, things needed to speed up. Because things needed to speed up, WWI may have contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic of 1918.

Efforts to help the U.S. in World War I resulted in the massive spread of the influenza epidemic. Factories were kept running, so if one worker had the virus, just coughing, or even breathing would spread it to the other workers. The disease would also spread at parades for Liberty Loan drives, and also at bond drives. At these largely populated gatherings, everyone attending has a great chance of catching the flu. One place this happened was in Philadelphia, where 200,000 gathered in efforts to help the War.

So many of those people were exposed to the virus and spread it to others. By September, 12,000 people had died in America, while it continued to spread to civilians all over the nation. "No one was safe!" ^{Unlike other flu outbreaks, this one didn't aim for the weak (very young and very old), it aimed at everyone, primarily young adults.}

Laws were passed requiring people to wear masks in public, and hopefully lessen the spreading of the disease. These laws did not stop the epidemic because the virus could pass through the masks. Civilians all over continued to unite but at the same time they were helping the epidemic reach its targets.

There were many efforts to try and stop the epidemic other than just passing laws to wear masks. In Washington D.C., Commissioner Lewis Brownlaw closed schools, theaters, and bars, and quarantined the sick so that there wouldn't be as much contact between people. At the same time, biochemists tried to make vaccines to kill the flu. Little did they know at the time, that vaccines kill bacteria and the flu was a virus. The flu's terror eventually just found an end. His worst was over. World War I at the same time was finding its end. The Armistice ended the great war and there were no more parades and band drives to contaminate more civilians.

Because of all the unity in the U.S. at

The time of WWI, it was easy for the influenza epidemic to spread. In a matter of 10 months, approximately 550,000 people died from the disease. That is more people that were killed in combat in all the American wars. It affected the majority of the human species all over the world (from soldiers bringing it over seas). The War contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic of 1918 because of all the unity it brought about and all the contact between American civilians and between people all over the world.

In 1918, when the influenza epidemic struck the United States, a major factor in its spread was the "Great War", or World War I. The crowded conditions of troops, the ease with which it was spread and the shortage of doctors at home, all effects of the war, would make the terrible disease worse.

To begin with, the disease was horrible enough on its own. The disease was spread by airborne particles, which meant that one could catch it simply by breathing. In a room full of people, a single cough would spread millions of particles, and by breathing, the entire room could catch it. On top of that, scientists had trouble identifying the disease. It was a virus, something new to scientists, and it wasn't like the influenza they knew. A vaccine was created, but since it was based on the flu bacteria and not the virus, it proved ineffective. The disease as a whole created a problem for scientists and doctors alike as they fervently rushed to try and treat it.

Because of this, the fact that America was at war made things even worse. The troop ships that soldiers were sent over on were extremely crowded, and the cramped quarters caused for easy spread of the disease. By just breathing it was spread. When the soldiers got overseas, it got even worse. The thousands of infected American soldiers spread the disease to French, German and other armies. Because of all the interaction caused by the war, it wasn't long before Europe, too, had to deal with the epidemic. At home, though, the country could not shut down like it wanted to, to stop the spread. They had to keep going to

Feed the war effort. Parades were held in which the people, "sardined in the streets", spread the flu just as easily as it was spreading overseas. The war adversely affected the disease, by giving it room and ability to spread quickly.

Normally, this might not be a problem. Unfortunately though, a majority of doctors were overseas treating war victims. This would lead to a shortage in doctors at home, and subsequently, a shortage of treatment for victims of the epidemic. Hospitals became crowded, and the death toll quickly rose. Because of the need of doctors in so many places, due to war, and the shortage of doctors treat the disease, it continued on almost unabated.

The "Great War" in Europe would give the influenza epidemic what it needed to survive. By creating virtual breeding grounds for contamination and limiting the number of available doctors, the war may have killed more people simply by allowing this to go on than it did through the fighting.

World War I may have contributed to the spread of the influenza epidemic of 1918. The infection of soldiers and civilians helped to spread the influenza virus worldwide during this period in time.

This epidemic was taken from an American army base to the battle field by way of infected soldiers. Soon after, soldiers from the English, French, and German armies were dying from influenza.

Also, gatherings in support of the war effort resulted in serious outbreaks of the virus. Due to the fact that most doctors and nurses were sent overseas to Europe. The doctors remaining were asked to perform a seemingly impossible task.

By September of that year some 12,000 people died of influenza in America. In Washington, Lewis Brown to restricted public gatherings. By the end of the war the epidemic killed millions of people all over Europe and America.

In November the armistice ended the war. The epidemic passed as the war ended.

Practice Paper A–Score Level 5

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5 in all qualities.

Practice Paper B–Score Level 3

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in meaning.

Practice Paper C–Score Level 4

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.

Practice Paper D–Score Level 5

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in organization and conventions.

Practice Paper E–Score Level 3

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.

**SESSION ONE – PART B – SCORING RUBRIC
READING AND WRITING FOR INFORMATION AND UNDERSTANDING**

QUALITY	Responses at this level: 6	Responses at this level: 5	Responses at this level: 4	Responses at this level: 3	Responses at this level: 2	Responses at this level: 1
<p>Meaning: the extent to which the response exhibits sound understanding, and interpretation, and analysis of the task and text(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -reveal an in-depth analysis of the documents -make insightful connections between information and ideas in the documents and the assigned task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -convey a thorough understanding of the documents -make clear and explicit connections between information and ideas in the documents and the assigned task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -convey a basic understanding of the documents -make implicit connections between information and ideas in the documents and the assigned task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -convey a basic understanding of the documents -make few or superficial connections between information and ideas in the documents and the assigned task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -convey a confused or inaccurate understanding of the documents -allude to the documents but make unclear or unwarranted connections to the assigned task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provide minimal or no evidence of understanding -make no connections between information in the documents and the assigned task
<p>Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant evidence from the document(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific details from the documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -develop ideas clearly and consistently, using relevant and specific details from the documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -develop some ideas more fully than others, using specific and relevant details from the documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -develop ideas briefly, using some details from the documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are incomplete or largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the documents are vague, irrelevant, repetitive, or unjustified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are minimal, with no evidence of development
<p>Organization: the extent to which the response exhibits direction, shape, and coherence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical and coherent structure through skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through use of appropriate devices and transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -maintain a clear and appropriate focus -exhibit a logical sequence of ideas but may lack internal consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -establish, but fail to maintain, an appropriate focus -exhibit a rudimentary structure but may include some inconsistencies or irrelevancies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -lack an appropriate focus but suggest some organization, or suggest a focus but lack organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -show no focus or organization
<p>Language Use: the extent to which the response reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through effective use of words, sentence structure, and sentence variety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -use language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose -vary structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose -occasionally make effective use of sentence structure or length 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -rely on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose -exhibit some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose -reveal little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are minimal -use language that is predominantly incoherent, inappropriate, or copied directly from the text
<p>Conventions: the extent to which the response exhibits conventional spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and usage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable -may be illegible or not recognizable as English

- If the student addresses only one text, the response can be scored no higher than a 3.
- If the student writes only a personal response and makes no reference to the text(s), the response can be scored no higher than a 1.
- Responses totally unrelated to the topic, illegible, incoherent, or blank should be given a 0.
- A response totally copied from the text(s) with no original student writing should be scored a 0.

In our modern age, when technological advancement and unbridled curiosity have made the world even smaller, it is evident that research and science should be encouraged. Treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels, not only because inhibiting their ventures to acquire wealth and riches impedes their business aims, but also because it would hamper scientific and historical discovery.

Treasure hunters, or salvors, are individuals who seek gold and treasure, but they are not ignorant of the historical value of the shipwrecks they explore. In recent times, respect for the historical integrity of a wreck has grown considerably. According to Steven Morgan, a prominent salvor who's been in the business for over thirty years, in the past "you'd take what's good, and everything else was dumped overboard," but modern projects are "protective of the sites. Today, a salvor is an archaeologist." This quote shows that profit isn't everything for these entrepreneurs.

Recent technologies such as survey equipment, better diving gear, and robots have made searching even the greatest depths of the ocean possible, and it is illogical not to put to use our abilities to discover and not to use the technology we worked so hard to develop. These technologies are often very expensive, and although some scientists and sea archaeologists such as George Bass and Cheryl Ward argue against funding this research through profits from the ~~from~~ shipwrecks, treasure seekers see it differently.

"We have the funding," says Tom Hideo, a salvor, "which is the difficulty they run into." Besides, laws like the Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987 and others allow states to claim a percentage of the profits, as well as the fact that private firms often turn over the "non-usable" - that is, non-metallic and not jewel-encrusted - artifacts to states, as in the case of Queen Anne's Revenge (Graphic 4).

In the age of scientific discovery and the exponential growth of knowledge, we all benefit from the work of these treasure hunters. Even the archaeologists and scientists who object to the salvors' work benefit when the artifacts ~~are~~ are shared. They themselves dig up artifacts from American Indian burial grounds and Egyptian pyramids and other places and sell them to museums. And when salvors are reckless or careless and toss priceless items back into the sea as happened with the De Braeck (Graphic #3), these items can be recovered using the same technologies that were used to discover them.

Treasure hunters should not be prohibited from conducting underwater searches for sunken vessels simply because they seek to become rich. Their discoveries benefit scientists, archaeologists, historians, and peoples' understanding of their cultural heritage.

Anchor Level 6–A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Reveals an in-depth analysis of the documents, arguing that treasure hunters, while making a profit from searching sunken vessels, also contribute to <i>scientific and historical discovery</i>. The response makes insightful connections between the documents and the task by supporting the treasure hunters’ <i>ventures</i> while acknowledging their occasionally <i>wreckless or careless</i> methods.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, first using a quotation from Steven Morgan (<i>Today, a salvor is an archaeologist</i>) to show <i>that profit isn’t everything for these entrepreneurs</i>. The response uses a wide range of specific and relevant details from the documents, arguing that <i>funding this research through profits from the shipwrecks</i>, though disliked by <i>some scientists and archaeologists</i>, is efficient. The response also discusses the Abandoned Shipwreck Act and other laws, and compares the work of the salvors to the work of <i>archeologists and scientists who object to it</i>, yet who <i>dig up artifacts and sell them to museums</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the benefits from the searching of sunken vessels shared by the treasure hunters and the <i>scientists, archaeologists, and historians</i>, as well as the general public. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure through the skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions (<i>not only ... but also, According to, although, Besides</i>).</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is generally precise and engaging with occasional imprecision (<i>This quote</i>), redundancy (<i>wealth and riches</i> and <i>gold and treasure</i>), and wordiness (<i>as well as the fact that</i>). The response has a notable sense of voice and an awareness of audience and purpose (<i>Treasure hunters should not be prohibited from conducting underwater searches from sunken vessels simply because they seek to become rich</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions with only minor errors in grammar.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.</p>	

The recent flourish of treasure hunters arising in the lucrative deep sea treasure business has damaged the history of a variety of cultures in a pitiful attempt to draw a profit. Archaeologists around the world have organized in an attempt to halt this unnecessary and discouraging business, and their reasons for doing so are quite justified.

The numerous amount of industries available to entrepreneurs looking to be successful these days is staggering. With that in mind, one must wonder why these treasure hunters are willing to sacrifice the last remaining clues archaeologists have to unlocking valuable secrets of the cultures of ancient civilizations for the almighty dollar. Many archaeologists believe that these hunters are ruining some of history's "richest 'graveyards'," and some even believe the deep sea wrecks should be treated just as American Indian burial grounds are.

Unfortunately, deep sea treasure hunting has become an attractive industry for a variety of reasons as of late. The new technology involved with the business, including survey equipment, diving gear and aquatic robots has been significantly enhanced. Additionally, the Internet has allowed the treasure hunters to go directly to potential buyers without requiring museum seals of approval that may otherwise be needed. Some organizations have even made deals with

Third World countries, agreeing to pay the countries a dividend of acquired fortunes. What profits these countries are actually reaping is doubtful. The rumor among archaeologists is that only the officials signing the permits see any reward. Clearly, however, historical significance of these wrecks is not an issue with these businessmen. Companies have seen raised wrecks as old as the fifth century B.C. (the Tektaş Burnu in Turkey).

Not only have the treasure hunters shown little regard for archaeologists' concerns, they have done exactly what the historians feared. In many past cases, historical artifacts have been destroyed due to the careless nature of the hunters' work. The DeBraak, found near the mouth of the Delaware Bay, was raised in 1984; the ship's salvaging damaged it greatly, and many of its artifacts were indeed lost. Archaeologists fear these occurrences, and point out that these types of artifacts are not only useful in their research but are in great demand by museums around the world. Even the slightest misstep by the salvors could cost archaeologists valuable data. Additionally, salvors discarding artifacts has become common in some circumstances, considering they have no historical knowledge or concern.

Arguments made by the salvors have repeatedly been discredited by archaeologists. The treasure hunters

claim they are needed in the recovery process since they are the ones doing the recovering; they claim the archaeologists won't have any artifacts to study if the salvors didn't work since no artifacts would be recovered. However, it has been proven that the archaeologists themselves have significantly contributed to the recovery process; many archaeological projects receive funding each year. Also, the salvors claim their work is necessary since the wrecks must be risen in a timely manner, claiming they decay more and more with each passing day. However, archaeologists point out that the wrecks are much more resilient than the hunters claim, and recovery should take place when it can be done with proper supervision.

Treasure hunter Phil Masters claims that salvors are "passionate about preservation". He feels the selling of artifacts is a financial necessity.

Archaeologists like George Bass call this the "big lie" because each year archaeological projects receive funding. Personal gain and greed are obviously the treasure hunters' motivation - not preservation.

Anchor Level 6–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Reveals an in-depth analysis of the documents, contrasting the treasure hunters' <i>lucrative deep sea treasure business</i>, with the archaeologists' desire to preserve <i>the history of a variety of cultures</i>. The response makes insightful connections between the documents and the task showing how <i>survey equipment, diving gear and aquatic robots</i>, and <i>the Internet</i> are being used by businessmen to exploit shipwrecks whose <i>historical significance</i> is for them <i>not an issue</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, using details to show how treasure hunters take advantage of <i>new technology</i>, make <i>deals with Third World countries</i>, and <i>claim their work is necessary</i>, but <i>are ruining some of history's "richest graveyards,"</i> and destroying historical artifacts through the <i>careless nature</i> of their work. The response skillfully uses quotations from Phil Masters and George Bass to expose the "big lie" about the financial necessity of selling artifacts.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus, exhibiting a logical and coherent structure by suggesting that business interests <i>are willing to sacrifice ... clues and valuable secrets</i> of the past for <i>profit</i>, then using a transitional sentence (<i>Not only have the treasure hunters ... they have done exactly what the historians feared</i>) to segue into examples of that abuse. Paragraph 4 skillfully presents claims of the salvors, then discredits them with the retorts of the archaeologists.</p>
Language Use	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is generally precise with occasional imprecision (<i>The recent flourish of treasure hunters</i>) and redundancy (<i>the numerous amount</i>). A variety of sentence types enhance meaning (<i>The treasure hunters ... would be recovered</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions with only minor errors in spelling (<i>Archaeologists</i>) and usage (<i>it's artifacts</i> and <i>must be risen</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	

Scouring the seas for ~~the~~ treasure and personal gain is detrimental to history. Unexperienced entrepreneurs and for-profit companies are destroying pieces of history that are fragile; once the ships are looted for gold, the sometimes more priceless historical artifacts are destroyed, lost to the sea forever. Treasure hunters must stop their grave robbing and leave the searching to the archaeologists.

Salvors have no right to take the valuables that they find and sell them for their own benefit. George Bass, Archaeological director of the Institute of Nautical Archaeology states, "One cannot tear down Mount Vernon and sell the bricks as souvenirs in the name of free enterprise,"; therefore, companies should not be allowed to destroy and sell the valuables from wrecks. These salvors, or grave robbers, are stealing valuable pieces of history. For instance, the DeBraak, a British warship, was destroyed by profit-hungry treasure seekers only caring about the gold and tossing "nonglittering items back overboard". By treating the other artifacts with disregard, they are ruining irreplaceable information about the past. Only concerned about the auction block, treasure hunters are destroying precious artifacts.

Greedy companies also take advantage of Third World countries in order to ravage and ruin more ship wrecks. The Cuban government signed a deal so that they would receive fifty percent of the ~~the~~ recovered treasure. These less developed countries are taken advantage of by salvors who have no right to take the artifacts anyway.

Laws are starting to be passed to prevent such abuses, but so far they have not had an enormous effect. The Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987 gave states ownership of abandoned wrecks within three miles of their coasts. However, this law has not had an enormous impact because much confusion and debate has occurred over what wrecks are really abandoned. Better wording and stricter acts could have saved valuable wrecks such as the DeGraaf. It was discovered in 1984 before the act, and so its valuable artifacts were lost. Hopefully, the international ban on treasure hunting will be enacted, and these precious pieces of history will be saved.

Thus, treasure hunters should leave the searching to the archaeologists. By stopping their looting of wrecks, ~~treasure~~ seekers will enable archaeologists to make use of the artifacts that they were lucky enough to find. Unprofessional and irresponsible robbing of shipwrecks must be stopped.

Anchor Level 5-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a thorough understanding of the documents stating that <i>treasure hunters must stop their grave robbing and leave the searching to the archaeologists</i> . The response makes clear and explicit connections between the documents and the task by referring to the results of such looting (<i>a British warship, was destroyed by profit-hungry treasure seekers</i>).
Development	Develops ideas clearly, using relevant and specific details from the documents. The response clearly explains how salvors <i>are ruining irreplaceable information about the past, greedy companies also take advantage of Third World Countries in order to ravage and ruin more shipwrecks, and laws are being passed to prevent such abuses</i> .
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the need to stop underwater treasure hunting. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas proceeding from a statement of thesis to discussion of the damages done by <i>salvors and greedy companies</i> and attempted solutions. The response concludes with a reassertion of the thesis. Transitions (<i>However and Thus</i>) provide coherence within and between paragraphs.
Language Use	Uses fluent and original language (<i>Scouring the seas for treasure and personal gain is detrimental to history</i>). The response varies sentence structure to control rhythm and pacing as in paragraph 1.
Conventions	Demonstrates control of the conventions with occasional spelling errors (<i>recieve, salvors, detrimental, unprofessional</i>)
Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5 in all qualities.	

Treasure hunters should be allowed to search for sunken vessels, with some compromise. The argument is that scientists believe that salvors are similar to grave robbers. In the past, artifacts were lost or thrown away, and shipwrecks were not intact after being searched. However, times have changed. With better equipment and state contracts, treasure seekers now realize the importance of the things they find underwater.

Scientists have valid reasons to believe that treasure hunters should not be allowed to search for sunken vessels. There have been many examples where artifacts or vessels have been destroyed, such as the DeBraak, which is spoken about in the graphic. The salvors of the warship "severely damaged" it, and lost many artifacts as well. Another negative issue is that when private salvors are dealing with exploring waters in Third World countries, there aren't strict regulations because the countries are in it for the profit. Nevertheless, lines 117 + 118 say that "some of the best archaeological work has been done by the private sector." Salvors use

their own money to explore, whereas archaeologists don't. There are millions of submerged vessels that are undiscovered, and now equipment and technology is so advanced that private salvors can find more, and people can learn more about the history of the vessels. Although both sides have a good argument, it is still a good idea for private salvors to be allowed to explore sunken vessels.

Underwater searches save shipwrecks from further damage, according to Tom Gidus in lines 90-94. Salvors now respect the historical value of wrecks, states lines 49 and 50. Some states, ^{like Florida,} now require permits for the exploration. All "nonvaluable" artifacts are available for the state to study, and the salvors have to submit reports on what they find. Artifacts must be conserved, and wrecks intact. Perhaps if all states that are by the ocean require these permits, scientists will feel better about the "grave robbers" of the sea. Also, Third World countries could make up permits to prevent problems, as well.

Perhaps the mysteries that lie beneath the sea will be solved, if treasure hunters

are allowed to explore sunken vessels. Better equipment now allows them to perform better searches. State required permits are preventing problems, and salvors respect the historical value of wrecks now.

Anchor Level 5–B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a thorough understanding of the documents by stating that <i>treasure hunters should be allowed to search for sunken vessels, with some compromise</i> . The response analyzes the information from the documents related to both sides of this issue, concluding that allowing private salvors to reclaim sunken vessels <i>is still a good idea</i> .
Development	Develops ideas clearly and consistently, using specific details about the destruction of <i>the DeBraak</i> , exploration of <i>waters in Third World countries</i> , the effect of new equipment and technology, and the results of new laws that <i>now require permits for ... exploration</i> to discuss the impact of treasure hunters.
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on the controversy surrounding private salvors established in the opening paragraph. The response has a logical sequence, moving from a statement of opinion in the first sentence, to a discussion of positive and negative issues, to an argument in favor of allowing <i>private salvors ... to explore sunken vessels</i> . Transitions are used effectively (<i>However, Another, Nevertheless</i>).
Language Use	Uses generally appropriate language that is sometimes awkward (<i>Salvors now respect the historical value of wrecks, states line 49 and 50 and Artifacts must be conserved, and wrecks intact</i>). The response occasionally makes use of effective sentence structures (<i>Salvors use their own money to explore, whereas archaeologists don't</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates control of the conventions with essentially no errors.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language use and stronger in conventions.	

Should private treasure hunters be allowed to to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels? There ~~is~~ is a plethora of evidence that supports private treasure hunters not being able to conduct underwater searches. The searching is wrong and done in improper fashions often. There are three primary examples why this is wrong: the ruining of historical wreckages, the improper sale of artifacts, and the involvement of smaller countries into making profits off of the wrecks by contracting private treasure hunters.

A supporting example can be seen in the numerous wrecks that have occurred while being recovered. This can be seen in the the wreck of the DeBraak. In 1984, while salvaging the ship it was damaged and crucial artifacts were lost and can never be recovered" Salvors... tossed nonglittering items back overboard, such as an 18th Century Royal Navy stove, one of only two in existence!" This

shows how the salvors can be destructive towards great works of historical significance.

Another supporting example can be seen in the mindless selling of artifacts. Salvors are bypassing museums and selling right to consumers over the Internet. "visitors can purchase silver coins from the shipwreck Atocha." showing the extreme exploit of history by physically selling true pieces of history. Another point that has to be taken into consideration is that many treasure hunters do not value the historical value; but only what he or she can obtain from the deal. Salvors turn the recoveries into profit business and commercialize our own pasts. JNA's chen// ward says, "As soon as you start talking about selling objects, you enter commercialization of the past." This is yet another primary reason to avoid from allowing salvors to destroy pieces of history.

The last example can be seen in the almost pirating of these wrecks by smaller countries. These countries sell out contracts to private hunters in search of making money. This is a disgrace, these poor nations, possibly sell out their own history. "cuba has recently granted two canadian companies permission to search its waters; in return, the cuban government is

promised 50 percent of any treasure recovered." These countries have no care for what condition the ships are recovered in. They are only looking for a cheap source of profit. This is a prime example of the abuse of these historical wrecks.

All examples show almost incriminating proof that ship wrecks should be left alone by salvors. Through their wrecking of the sites, to their sale of timeless historical artifacts it just shows the evil in it. These modern day pirates steal away the respect these sites deserve. Along with the red tape of state and country laws, salvors mistreat sites and disrespect our ancestors remembrance by cheapening it through private commercial sales of people's former lives. The examples given provide for unmistakable proof that these treasure hunters are wrong in every sense of the word.

Anchor Level 5–C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Conveys a thorough understanding of the documents (<i>There is a plethora of evidence that supports private treasure hunters not being able to conduct underwater searches</i>). The response makes clear and explicit connections between the information and ideas in the text and documents, by expressing <i>three primary examples why this is wrong</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently. The response cites details from the text about <i>the wreck of the DeBraak, the mindless selling of artifacts, and the almost pirating of these wrecks by smaller countries</i> to show why treasure hunters should not be allowed to salvage shipwrecks.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on why <i>searching by private treasure hunters is wrong</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas supporting the opinion with three examples. The conclusion further serves to unify the response. Appropriate transitions (<i>Another supporting example</i> and <i>The last example</i>) are used throughout the response.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is generally appropriate but sometimes awkward (<i>wrecks that have occurred while being recovered</i> and <i>This is yet another primary reason to avoid from allowing salvors to destroy pieces of history</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure but with uneven success (<i>Through their wrecking of the sites, to their sale of timeless historical artifacts it just shows the evil in it</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>inproper</i> and <i>historacal</i>), capitalization (<i>cuba</i>), punctuation (<i>In 1984, while salvaging the ship it was damaged</i>), agreement (<i>hunters ... he or she</i>), usage (<i>avoid from</i>), and proofreading (<i>allowed to conduct</i> and <i>artificats</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language use and conventions.</p>	

There are literally more than a million sunken ships at the bottom of the sea. The majority of these ships contain precious artifacts that are relative to this time and therefore, should be treated with care.

Almost all shipwrecks contain precious artifacts. Such artifacts have helped us understand the past better. A good example of this would be the Titanic or some of the thousands of pirate ships that now exist only at the bottom of the sea. It would be strange to know of the fate of the Titanic from historical documents but never have any hard evidence from it. Through the excavation of ships we are able to have an even better understanding of the technology and social issues of the time as well as history on specific people from their sunken belongings.

But, there is a threat to such pieces of history. Salvagers are destroying artifacts and even whole ships searching for buried treasure. They are essentially "mug" the ship, stealing only what has the potential to be expensive. A good example of this is the DeBrook, a British warship sunk in 1798 near Delaware bay (as shown by the chart), where of whose artifacts were lost

to careless, greedy salvagers looking for sunken treasure.

Although I am not opposed to such "hunting", I believe there should be more strict laws set down by (or instead of) the A.S.A., or the Abandoned Shipwreck Act. This act allowed the ownership of any discovered shipwreck found three miles off the coast of any state to that state. What we need is laws to govern the procedure of salvage excavation that will appeal to both the scientific community and salvagers. Through such laws, we could ensure the safety of the artifacts and the ship itself in any excavation wreck.

Through acts such as the A.S.A., we can guarantee the well being of our history. With the cooperation that could exist between scientists and salvagers, we could discover many secrets of our past, and of the sea.

Anchor Level 4-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the documents, stating that the <i>precious artifacts ... should be treated with care</i> . The response implies that since <i>such artifacts have helped us understand the past</i> , for-profit <i>salvagers</i> need to be restrained by <i>more strict laws</i> .
Development	Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response uses specific and relevant details about the value of <i>precious artifacts that have helped us understand the past</i> and how salvagers present <i>a threat to such peices of history</i> , but the discussion of the <i>Abandoned Shipwreck Act</i> is less developed.
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus, arguing that preservation of artifacts is important in order to have a <i>better understanding of the technology and social issues</i> of other time periods. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, explaining first the value of the <i>excavation</i> of ships, then discussing the <i>threat</i> to those artifacts from salvagers, and concluding that with <i>laws to govern ... excavation</i> , both <i>scientists and salvagers</i> would benefit.
Language Use	Uses appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>Through acts such as the A.S.A., we can garuntee the well being of our history</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure (<i>Through such laws, we could ensure the safety of the artifacts and the ship itself in any excavated wreck</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>peices</i> and <i>sceintific</i>), capitalization (<i>Deleware bay</i>), and grammar (<i>What we need is laws</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4.	

Today more than ever people debate whether treasure hunters should be allowed to search underwater vessels. I believe they should certainly be allowed ~~while the government does~~ for many reasons. One such reason is time and another is money.

As ship wreckage underwater then slowly degrade causing increased damage due to oxidation. Precious items such as antique stoves begin to rust and documents decay to an illegible form. The government, while finding vessels, has a budget. And surfacing old ships which is both timely and costly is not a main concern. ~~For~~ On the other hand treasure hunters such as Phil Masters says that "treasure hunters are passionate about preservation." As seen by the graph 9 ships have been found and discovered and while such ships ^{as the Brierley} brought a profit of \$5.3 million, it still means the remains were salvaged in time. _{Johnston}

The major concern is the preservation of history, and while valid it is possible to argue that history is better studied upon land than decaying in the bottom of the ocean. ^{people do own masterpieces privately, such as} It also believe that as suggested some regulation might aide to preserve documents that were reportedly

discarded in the excavation of De Braak.

Finally, excavation is beneficial to learn about the history, about what happened and how it was done. To raise the ships and gather the information is a very important aspect and should be done sooner instead of waiting for later.

* certain Monnet's and Renoirs

Anchor Level 4-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the documents, arguing that <i>time</i> and <i>money</i> are among the <i>many reasons</i> to allow treasure hunters to search sunken vessels. The response implies that because <i>government ... has a budget</i>, treasure hunters, who <i>are passionate about preservation</i>, should be allowed to continue their work with <i>some regulation</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some details from the text and graphic to demonstrate the need for excavation in a timely manner (<i>As ship wrecks age underwater their slowly degrade and antique stoves ... rust and documents decay</i>). The response briefly acknowledges that one <i>major concern is the preservation of history</i> but does not develop the point beyond a single mention of <i>documents ... reportedly discarded from the DeBraak</i>.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus, arguing that treasure hunters should be allowed to search sunken vessels and concluding that <i>to raise the ships and gather the information ... should be done sooner</i> rather than <i>later</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, suggesting that since searching vessels <i>is not a main concern</i> for government private treasure hunters should be allowed to search them.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses appropriate language with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>I believe they should certainly be allowed</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence length and structure with uneven success, mixing fragmentary ideas (<i>And surfacing old ships which is both timely and costly is not a main concern</i>) with complex thoughts (<i>One major concern ... of the ocean</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting errors in spelling (<i>excevation</i> and <i>beneficial</i>), punctuation (<i>Mannet's</i>), and grammar (<i>treasure hunters such as Phil Masters says</i>).</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in development and language use.</p>	

Treasure hunters may believe that what they do could prevent ships from further damage. But in all reality they may actually be causing it.

In the case of the De Brack salvors vandalized the ship by throwing items they thought of no value overboard. One of the most valuable was a 18th century Royal Navy stove, one of only two in existence. And when the ship was raised in 1986, many artifacts fell out of the ship back into the sea.

Salvors also sell precious coins and artifacts to private collectors for money. An example would be when the Brother Johnathan was found. Recently a coin auction from the wreck sold \$5.3 million in coins.

There are some laws that help to regulate the number of treasure hunters and what they can sell. The state of Florida, for example, requires companies to give regular archaeological reports. Also things not valuable to the salvors are free to the state for study. They must also agree to preserve artifacts and leave wrecks intact to receive a permit.

The ASA, Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987, says that states may obtain owner ship of all abandoned wrecks within a 3 mile radius of their coasts. The only problem with this is that the use of the word abandoned is not

defined in this law. That is what allowed Canada and a salvage firm to sell the coins from the Brother Johnathan.

Therefore I believe that salvors should not be allowed to search for shipwrecks unless working with archaeologist to preserve the findings. Because of the damage the cause to historical ships and valuable contents of the ships.

Anchor Level 4-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the documents, using information from both the article and the graphic to argue that <i>treasure hunters</i> cause <i>damage</i> to sunken vessels. The response makes implicit connections to the task, stating that salvors <i>sell precious coins and artifacts to private collectors</i> but does not clearly relate this information to the task.
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using some details from the text to describe the damage done by salvors but does not elaborate.
Organization	Maintains a clear focus on the negative impact of treasure hunters. The response usually exhibits a logical sequence of ideas through the use of transitions (<i>In the case of, The only problem, Therefore</i>) but lacks transitions between paragraphs 3 and 4, and 4 and 5.
Language Use	Uses appropriate language with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>Therefore I believe that salvors should not be allowed to search for shipwrecks</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure as in the last two sentences of paragraph 2.
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>actully, vandilized, acution</i>), usage (<i>was rised</i>), comma omissions (<i>Therefore I</i>), and proofreading oversights (<i>the may and the number or treasure hunters</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in development.	

Imagine yourself in heaven looking down upon the earth watching everyone at work. A detective has entered your still-standing house after fifty years and he begins searching through all of your personal items and accessories. What is he doing, you ask yourself in rage. He has no right to rummage through your life of well worth! You want to stop him, but wait, you are dead, you cannot do anything now.

There has been concern in the past whether or not to allow treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. For many salvors this is okay, because sure they get to make money and profit off the historic items they find. But for others, interrupting the rested and the peace is wrong. To have treasure hunters dig up historical ship wrecks is like opening up a buried coffin to see what the person looked like. It is not economically or morally right to allow treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels.

The passage mentions how treasures from history are being destroyed by the uneducated to correctly search sunken vessels. These salvors are called "grave robbers." George Bass, archaeological director of the Institute of Nautical Archaeology remarks, "One cannot tear down Mount Vernon and sell the bricks as souvenirs in the name of free enterprise, so why should we allow so-called entrepreneurs to destroy and sell nails from, say, the flagship of John Paul Jones?" I believe he is right. It is unjust to dig up history like it is our own and sell pieces of it to people who probably have no idea what it is about.

Also, many salvors who dig up sunken vessels do not have the knowledge of how they can destroy such a piece of history. They are known to throw back items that have great worth. According to the

article, in 1986 when the DeBraak, a British warship was raised by cranes, "an avalanche of artifacts slid out, falling back into the sea." Mishaps such as this cost a conflict of irreplaceable data.

Many people think allowing treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels is a great idea to preserve and discover history, but many factors conclude that it is wrong and reckless to destroy history in its place.

Anchor Level 3-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the text (<i>It is not economically or morally right to allow treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels</i>). The response makes implicit connections between ideas in the text and the task, drawing an analogy between a detective searching a <i>still-standing house after fifty years</i> and treasure hunters' <i>underwater searches for sunken vessels</i> . The response further connects such searches to salvors who have ruined <i>historical ship wrecks</i> . There is no reference to the graphic.
Development	Develops some ideas more fully than others, using details from the text to discuss how salvors' ignorance has caused the destruction of sunken vessels such as <i>the DeBraak</i> . However, the response makes no reference to the graphic.
Organization	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on why salvors should not be allowed to conduct underwater searches. The response is logically organized with an introduction suggesting an imaginary situation that is related to the focus, a body elaborating on the reasons why treasure hunters should not be allowed <i>to conduct underwater searches</i> , and a conclusion.
Language Use	Uses generally appropriate language with some awareness of audience and purpose but is weakened by the use of language that is at times inappropriate (<i>okay, sure, profit off</i>) or imprecise (<i>your life of well worth</i> and <i>Mishaps such as this cost a conflict of irreplaceable data</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control of conventions with occasional errors in spelling (<i>interrupting</i>), punctuation (<i>You want to stop him, but wait, you are dead, you cannot do anything now</i>), grammar, and usage (<i>like</i> for "as if") that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, in all qualities, but it remains at Level 3 because it makes no reference to the graphic.	

History is a very important issue to many people around the world. It is the destruction of this history by selfish independent companies that is the problem. Also, some laws are supposed to regulate these businesses and what they can do. Many people are also debating on who should get the artifacts once a vessel has been recovered.

Many people love history, it's like a passion. However, when someone hears that a great clue to history has been destroyed, it can cause a problem for an individual, and the company causing the problem. For example, the DeBrook was a warship of the British it was sunk during battle. Soldiers tossed anything back into the ocean that didn't sparkle or come to their attention.

There are laws that are supposed to regulate salvaging. The Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987 (ASA) granted that states have claim to ships three miles from their coast.

Artifacts are a great subject in the argument of salvaging. Because some scientists feel that independent companies are too careless, they have tried many times to put limits on what salvagers can do. Private (independent) companies want to send keep all artifacts for themselves. ~~and~~ later, they wish to sell the artifact to make themselves rich. The problem is, who owns the artifacts? Should a country get the cargo from a sunken vessel?

There is one thing I strongly believe, and this is

that all wrecks should be left to archeologists. Independent companies should at least give these artifacts to museums for the whole world to view, not just some rich man in Hollywood.

Anchor Level 3-B

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Conveys a basic understanding of the text by stating <i>I strongly believe ... that all wrecks should be left to archeologists</i> . The response makes superficial connections between the text and the task (<i>Many people love history</i> and <i>Artifacts are a great subject in the argument of salvaging</i>). There is no reference to the graphic.
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using some details from the text. The response mentions the destruction of <i>the De Braak</i> and <i>laws ... to regulate salvaging</i> , but little elaboration is provided. There is no reference to the graphic.
Organization	Establishes an appropriate focus in the last paragraph, although it is not clearly connected to the discussion of history in paragraphs 1 and 2. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>History is very important</i>) with some awareness of purpose (paragraph 5). The response exhibits some imprecision (<i>people are ... debating on</i>) and redundancy (<i>sparkle or come to their attention</i>). Attempts to vary sentence structure are unevenly successful (<i>when someone hears that a great clue to history has been destroyed, it can cause a problem for an individual, and the company causing the problem</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control with occasional errors in spelling (<i>businesse, believe, archeologists</i>), punctuation (<i>history, its</i> and <i>1198 it</i>), and proofreading (<i>the British it 1198</i> and <i>from is sunken vessel</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.	

Members of My Science Club have decided to debate the question of whether or not treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. I am against the idea that treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels.

Treasure hunters have been going underwater to look for valuable sunken treasures. Many have failed, and many have succeeded in their attempt to find valuable treasures. Treasure hunters conduct this search only to gain a profit out of what they find.

Many hunters have ruined many priceless possessions from the past. I think that removing sunken vessels from under the water is a bad idea. For one, as I said before, priceless possessions are ruined, and history from the past is sold for ridiculous amounts of money. Everytime a sunken vessel is raised up to land, history from the past is lost.

In conclusion I think that searching for sunken vessels should be banned, and parts of history that was left underwater, should stay there. Many treasure hunters get really greedy, and all they think about is the money, they would do anything beyond their limits to get their hands on valuable treasures from the past.

Anchor Level 3-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Conveys a basic understanding of the text by asserting <i>I am against the idea that treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches</i>. The response makes few connections to the text and no connections to the graphic.</p>
Development	<p>Is incomplete, hinting at ideas but references to the text are repetitive (<i>look for valuable sunken treasures</i> and <i>attempt to find valuable treasures</i>) or irrelevant (<i>Many have failed, and many have succeeded</i>). The response hints at ideas about profit ruined ... <i>possessions</i> and lost history but does not elaborate. There is no mention of the graphic.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains an appropriate focus (<i>searching for sunken vessels should be banned</i>). The response exhibits a rudimentary structure consisting of an introduction, two body paragraphs, and a summary.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>all they think about is the money</i>) with some imprecision (<i>they would do anything beyond their limits to get their hands on valuable treasures from the past</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control with occasional errors in spelling (<i>wether</i> and <i>possessions</i>), punctuation (<i>In conclusion I; underwater, should; money, they</i>), and agreement (<i>parts ... was</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in development and stronger in conventions.</p>	

The issue of tonight's meeting will be to discuss the issue of sunken vessels. Tonight I will be trying to persuade you see why we should infer the idea of treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels.

The passage implies that there are a lot of treasures that are worth looking for. There can be anything from gold to "Basketballs".

The graphics show that there were also ships that have valuable things like Brother Jonathan was worth 5.3 million (Near Cali). I believe it is worth it.

My fellow science club members, ASK YOURSELF "Do you want 5.3 Million Dollars?" Then let me persuade you to help get a group to look. It's what we all like to do and what do we have to lose. The Benefits out

weigh the negatives so
lets do it!

Anchor Level 2-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys an inaccurate understanding of the documents and purpose (<i>Tonight I will be trying to persuade you see why we should inforce the idea of treasure hunters to conduct underwater searches for sunkn vessels.</i>) The response alludes to the documents but attempted connections are unclear.
Development	Is largely undeveloped, using vague and unjustified references to the documents (<i>Do you want 5.3 Million Dalars?</i>).
Organization	Establishes but fails to maintain an appropriate focus, first saying <i>the issue of tonights meeting will be to discuse the issue of sucken vessels</i> , then shifting to an attempt to persuade <i>fellow science club members ... to help get a group to look for sunken treasure</i> . The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, containing some irrelevancies (<i>It's what we all like to do</i>).
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise and unsuitable for the audience [<i>The graphics show that are shown to show and things like Brother Jonathon was worth 5.3 million (Near Cali)</i>]. The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect.
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>sucken, inforce, implys, alot</i>), punctuation (<i>"Basketballs"</i> and <i>Ask yourself</i>), and capitalization (<i>Benefits</i> and <i>Dalars</i>) that hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.	

I decided to debate against the idea that treasures hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels.

The treasures hunters should not be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels, because this causes damage, they don't acknowledge that down there it gets destroyed, by the equipment that they use and lack knowledge of the vessels. The governments of some countries allow searches of their water because salvage companies offer the governments shared profits but they lie because they take more than the governments.

Anchor Level 2-B

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Alludes to the documents, arguing against treasure hunting by negating two repetitions of a statement copied from the prompt (<i>treasures hunters should not be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels</i>).
Development	Is largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas. The response mentions damage (<i>they don't acknowledge that down there it gets destroyed, by the equipment ... and lack knowledge of the vessels</i>) but fails to elaborate.
Organization	Suggests a focus on damage but lacks organization. The response begins with a prompt-dependent one sentence introduction, followed by a body paragraph made up of random ideas. There is no conclusion.
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise (<i>I decided to debate against the idea</i>). The response exhibits little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect.
Conventions	Is minimal, containing only two sentences of original student writing, which makes assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.	

Against Sunken Vessels the treasure hunters should not be allowed to conduct under water searches for sunken vessels. The article is titled Sunken Vessels and written by Brendan Koener. In the next few paragraphs I will be discussing if Sunken Vessels are allowed under water to find the Sunken Vessels.

In the article Koener tells us about Sunken Vessels and how they work. He talks about "Queen Anne Revenge" it is a private boat. It was in the 18th Century. John Lawrence Bee invented. Sunken Vessels are boats that have been under water for many years. George Bass has financial problems and he calls it "the big lie pointing" out the scores.

In the graphic it shows the Lost and Found of many "significant shipwreck sites around the world." For example

Brother Johnathan his boat sank in Present City in California. He was found in 1993. This whole crash caused \$5.3 billion dollars. The abandoned shipwreck Act would not apply whydah because the artifacts were displayed by the National Geographic Society. In all of these shipwrecks I agree that they should be allowed underwater to search for the sunken vessels because if we do not allowed them then who will go under water to find the sunken vessels.

In the article another example is that Brother ~~Johnson~~ Jonathan, was a shipwreck in California during 1865. He was a person who went under water to search for the sunken vessels, and but his ship went down in California in 1865.

In conclusion all of these shipwrecks they were all very good people who went under-

water searching for sunken vessels. It was a great lost for whoever ship went down when they on the boat that is how they died.

Anchor Level 2-C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Conveys a confused and inaccurate interpretation of the documents (<i>I will be discussing if sunken vessels are allowed under water to find the sunken vessels</i>). The response alludes to the documents but makes unclear connections to the assigned task (<i>The abandoned shipwreck Act would not apply Whydah because the artifacts were displayed by the National Geographic Society</i>).
Development	Is largely undeveloped, using vague, unjustified (<i>This whole crash causted \$5.3 billion dollars</i>). and repetitive (<i>Brother Johnathan his boat sank in Cresent City in California and Brother Jonathan, was a shipwreck in California during 1865</i>) references to the documents.
Organization	Lacks an appropriate focus (<i>I will be discussing if sunken vessels are allowed under water to find the sunken vessels</i>). The response suggests some organization (<i>In the next few paragraphs, In the article, In conclusion</i>) but lacks coherence within paragraphs, consisting largely of random, unrelated ideas.
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise (<i>Against sunken vessels the treasure hunters should not be allowed to conduct under water searches</i>). The response exhibits little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect (<i>It was a great lost for who ever ship went down when they on the boat that is how they died</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>finacial, California, causted</i>), punctuation (<i>For example Brother Johnathan and Brother Jonathan, was a shipwreck</i>), usage (<i>allowed</i>), and proofreading (<i>Johnathan</i>) that make comprehension difficult.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2.	

Due to the subject of the debate,
I feel it is morally wrong to
burn for sunken vessels.
First off, many valuable
resources, plants and
fish can be disturbed. It's
also a pointless cause. Who
really cares about some
sunken boats. It's a waste of
time and energy. There
can be no good coming
out of this. It's just a
waste of time. There's also
not enough funding
for a project like this.
The money and man
power exceed the point of
the project.

Anchor Level 1-A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides minimal evidence of understanding, consisting instead of a personal response without reference to the documents. Although the response states <i>I feel its morally wrong to dive for sunken vessels</i> , no connection is made between this statement and the documents.
Development	Is largely undeveloped. The reasons for the stated opinion are vague (<i>There can be no good coming out of this</i>), repetitive (<i>Its a waste of time and energy</i>), and unjustified (<i>natraul rescources Plants and fish can be disturbed</i>).
Organization	Suggests a focus on the morality of diving for sunken vessels but shows no evidence of organization, using unrelated opinion statements (<i>Its just a waiste of time</i>).
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise (<i>a pointless cause</i>) and unsuitable for audience and purpose (<i>First off</i>). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect (<i>The time and man power exceed the point of the project</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>valuble</i> and <i>natraul</i>) and punctuation (<i>Its</i> and <i>Theres</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Levels 1, 2 and 3, but remains at Level 1 because it makes no reference to the documents.	

In Passage 1, I agree that it will be a great idea that treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. It will be a great thing to know what happened in the past, to know the history.

Anchor Level 1-B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides minimal evidence of understanding, suggesting that <i>Passage 1</i> argues that <i>treasure hunters should be allowed to search for sunken vessels</i> . The response makes no other connection between the documents and the assigned task.
Development	Is minimal. The response uses no details from the documents to support its assertion.
Organization	Suggests a focus on allowing treasure hunters to search for sunken vessels, but is too brief to demonstrate organization.
Language Use	Is minimal.
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 1, although it is somewhat stronger in organization.	

In the recent controversy over treasure hunters of the sea, I feel they should not be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. Selling and often destroying crucial artifacts is demeaning to our history.

In many treasure hunts, salvors lack the knowledge of historical value and destroy artifacts in their greedy search for precious metals and gems. The shipwreck of the *Beaumont* was severely damaged by treasure hunters and many of its artifacts were lost. These lost facts can never be found and are a part of our world history that we will never know. The precise and planned out searches of archaeologists strive to preserve every piece of history they can find. The greed and money that drives the salvors to shipwrecks is an insult to passionate archaeologists and our history. Salvors argue that they have more funding than archaeologists so they hunt for shipwrecks to preserve while scientists wait for funding. This is not true says George Bass an archaeologist who claims they have the funding but will never agree with the selling of priceless treasures from the past.

It is morally wrong to sell artifacts for profit. The *Brother Jonathan* shipwreck raked in \$5.3 million in a recent auction. These

are pieces of history and should not be bought; they should be studied by scientists and put in museums. These coins and gems are not the salvors to sell; they are actually the property of various governments.

The 2 tons of gold believed to be in the I-52 Japanese submarine belong to Japan because they are part of their history. The ship wrecks are also burial grounds and should be regarded as such. The ^{greedy} salvors lack respect for the historical and emotional value of the artifacts.

I strongly believe that treasure hunters should not be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. We should fight for regulations and laws prohibiting underwater searches by treasure hunters around the world. We need to preserve history, not sell it.

As a member of the science club, I feel that treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct any types of underwater searches in the ocean. By doing this it could help us to get more in touch with history from all sorts of past decades and centuries. Ships have been found which were believed to be Queen Anne's Revenge flagship, used by blackbeard the pirate. German U-boats, ancient Roman trading ships, and even certain unknown ship crews have all been found in many different parts of the world.

By discovering these ships we may be able to unlock any certain unsolved mysteries from the past, or even discover something new, never before found in history.

During an expedition near the Turkish city of Cesme, a fifth-century B.C. ship wreck of unknown origin was discovered. Certain artifacts from these ships can also be available to the public now, thanks to the internet. People could now own a piece of history by purchasing pieces of silver coins priced from \$75 and \$3,000, or other small artifacts of a ship such as a toothpick from a certain ship. Treasure hunters and countries can have even negotiable to search areas of waters by certain countries, and split any found artifacts with that country, if anything were to possibly be discovered. In conclusion it would help people benefit if treasure hunters work on discovering these certain missing ships.

In current issues related to science, there is a debate between archaeologists and treasure hunters referring to underwater searches for sunken vessels. ~~Treasure hunters~~ ~~Archaeologists~~ Archaeologists don't agree with treasure hunters looking for underwater vessels because they feel it will destroy the artifacts. I personally disagree with the archaeologists, and think it's a good idea to do underwater searches.

Archaeologists main concern is that treasure hunters are doing it all for money. George Bass relates ~~them~~ ^{salvors} to grave robbers and says "One cannot tear down Mount Vernon and sell the bricks as souvenirs in the name of free enterprise." That is true in a sense, but how are we supposed to learn about shipwrecks if they are underwater and we can't investigate artifacts? Archaeologists are afraid that salvors will completely ~~destroy~~ dismantle historical artifacts but this is not the case. For a treasure hunter to receive a state permit for the kind of work they do, they have to agree to conserve artifacts and keep the wrecks in tact. Archaeologists are right about one thing, the treasure hunters are making good money off ^{of} artifacts. For example the Brother Jonathan ^{which} sank in California in 1865 and was discovered

in 1993, ~~was~~ made \$5.3 million from coins discovered in the wreck. Archaeologists argue that it shouldn't be about money, when it's really not. The Whydah sank in 1717 and was later found in 1984 and it's artifacts were shown at the National Geographic Society where people could learn all about it. Same thing with the SS Central America. The book, Ship of Gold in the Deep Blue Sea was inspired by the hunt for this ship.

Many people may feel that by conducting underwater searches and selling artifacts, it's destroying the history and the artifacts themselves but as Tom Greider states, "They don't acknowledge that every day stuff stays down there, it gets destroyed." So in all actuality, we are saving history and in the process, learning more about it.

Many people have dreams. Anyone who has dreams know persuing them would be a great experience. He is passionate about preservation. He said Selling artifacts is necessary. It isn't anyone's business if a man goes under water to explore. Also the sunken ships dont belong to the government, how could they possibly tell you, you cant touch anything under water. Its unheard of, this situation is like a monkey having a pile of bananas, he dies and another monkey comes along and takes the pile of bananas. Was it a crime for the monkey to take the food? No, so is it wrong for an explorer to search for under water vessels, I certainly dont think so. The people putting up an argument for this case are really making a big deal out of nothing. Then theres the situations in Cuba where 50 percent of anything found has to go to the Cuban government. Thats saying the government is God, the creator of the ocean and anything in their belongs to them. This is all self-explanatory, there is no big deal in having the explorers do their job, so please leave it alone.

Treasure hunters should be allowed to conduct underwater searches for sunken vessels. There is no reason why they shouldn't. People only profit from this, no one loses.

In the 21st century, we are equipped to find nearly everything on the earth. According to Brendan Kerner's "Sunken Vessels," "the latest generation of survey equipment, diving gear, and aquatic robots puts even the deepest wrecks within reach." My question is, "Why not utilize our great technology that we have?"

Underwater searches help us find artifacts no longer available. For example, "an 18th-century Royal Navy store, one of two in existence, ~~can~~^{may} be found. Many artifacts are basically extinct, but can be brought back to life if found during underwater searches.

Many countries cannot afford to spend money on these costly searches. However, they can still profit from them. Like, "the Cuban government is promised 50 percent of any treasure recovered," in an agreement they have with ~~the~~ Canadian companies who were given permission to search its waters.

Every few years a new ship is found, and it is like money or history falling from the sky.

According to a graphic, "Lost and Found," the Brother Jonathan was found in 1993, netting \$5.3 million. This is found money. More money is out there. ~~The~~ Like the I-52, sunk in 1944, "is thought to contain a cargo of 2 tons of gold."

Why not look for what is out there? True, it may be costly, but it's the treasure hunters gamble, and you don't lose anything.

Practice Paper A–Score Level 5

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language use.

Practice Paper B–Score Level 3

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.

Practice Paper C–Score Level 4

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.

Practice Paper D–Score Level 2

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.

Practice Paper E–Score Level 4

Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in development.