

Term limits on congressional law-makers is a long debated subject. For years political scientists and people have debated and each side presenting strong evidence for their personal belief. However logically speaking, it is reasonable to side with the "no terms" side of debate for numerous reasons. I do not deny the cons provided with no terms but the pros heavily outweigh! Why? Mainly because it is undemocratic and ultimately Democracy favors on the people and the people run the democratic government, despite the cons that may affect the country.

Experience in a work-place matters much more than anything else, thus why companies generally hire experienced employees. In the same ~~context~~ idea but in a different context, congressional law-makers with experience should be termless and only their job will end if the people decide it so because it is democratic. To support this, in Text 1 it states "Lawmakers who have earned the trust of the people and have proven themselves to be honest and effective leaders should

not have their terms cut short." (Text 1, Line 50-52) Factually speaking term limits will only introduce un-experienced workers which is detrimental to the nation.

If we were to have congressional term limits we would then have to kick out effective Congressmen. A strict time pressure would allow for poor work qualities (Text 4, Lines 50-55)

"Doesn't it make more sense to capitalize on their abilities ~~and~~ skills, effectiveness ~~at a job~~ talents and experience rather than forcing them <sup>inside</sup> where they will do poorly."

Granted corruption is an issue as mentioned by the opposing side but that is only a minor issue.

I suggest a ratification or a new amendment that allows citizens to impeach congressional workers if they were found to be doing so.

In the end setting term limits takes power away from the voters. "A fundamental principle of our government is that voters get to directly choose their representatives"

---

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 3 – A

---

Text 1, Line (5-14) and "infor  
inherently have the power to limit  
forms simply by voting law-makers out"  
(Text 3, Line (5-14))

---

### Anchor Level 3-A

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*it is reasonable to side with the “no terms” side of debate ... Mainly because it is undemocratic*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*Experience in a work-place matters much more than anything else ... In the same idea ... Congressional lawmakers with experience should be termless*), insufficiently distinguishing the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Granted corruption is an issue as mentioned by the opposing side but that is only a minor issue*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*Lawmakers who have earned the trust of the people and have proven themselves to be honest and effective leaders should not have their terms cut short*”... *term limits will only introduce un-experienced workers*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 4, Lines 50-55) and (Text 3, Line 13-14)], both adding and changing the wording of quoted text. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an introductory paragraph identifying a claim and stating that the *pros heavily outweigh* the cons of having *no terms*, developing a body paragraph about the importance of *Experience* in a job then transitioning to what would happen to that experience *If we were to have congressional term limits* and concluding with an acknowledgement that the *opposing side* sees *corruption* as an issue, but then moves to a personal plan about *ratification of a new amendment* and a reiteration of the claim and two new text quotations. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*For years political scientists and People have debated and each side proposing strong evidence for their personal beliefs; effect for “affect”; thus why*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension [*congressional law-makers; However logically speaking, it; no terms but; interened; their jobs ... it; un-expeirienced; miner; 14*]).

U.S. Congressional lawmakers should not have term limits. Congressional lawmakers need age, wisdom, and experience. If we had term limits the honest, and effective one would get removed. Doing so would let new corrupt, power-hungry and incompetent lawmakers come in charge. Here are my 3 reasons why lawmakers should not have term limits.

In Text 1, line 50 it states "The longer you do a job, the better you get at it." Being a lawmaker you have to use past mistakes to help shape the future with better laws. If you constantly having new lawmakers your going have a problem making laws that protects everyone. They might bring new ideas, but an experienced lawmaker would be able to tell if it would be good due to their experience.

If we had term limits that would automatically kick out the effective lawmakers. In Text 4, line 50 it states "Doesn't it make more sense to capitalize on their skills, talents and experience?" These limits would remove the lawmakers who has done amazing work in their field. Kicking out the good is just an invest to let the bad come in.

"Without long-term legislators, according to another anti-term-limit argument, "inexperienced" legislators won't be able to control the permanent bureaucracy." This was stated in Text 3 line 25, and I agree with that statement based off the

new lawmakers won't be able to control the bureaucracy. Doing that would leave different people with higher power, and unable to make the right choices. That's why U.S. Congressional lawmakers shouldn't have a term limit.

---

**Anchor Level 3-B**

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*U.S. Congressional lawmakers should not have term limits. Congressional lawmakers need age, wisdom, and experience*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*Being a lawmaker you have to use past mistakes to help shape the future with better laws* and *These limits would remove the lawmakers who has done amazing work in their feild*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*I agree with that statement...new lawmakers won't be able to control the bureaucracy...and unable to make the right choices*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*Doesn't it make more sense to capitalize on their skills, talents and experience*” and “*Without long-term legislators, according to another anti-term limit argument, “inexperienced” legislators won't be able to control the permanent bureaucracy*”). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, including only the first line number of cited information (*In Text 1, line 50* and *in Text 3 line 25*). The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay by introducing a claim and three reasons not to have U.S. Congressional term limits followed by three supportive arguments that dispute opposing views by focusing on the need for experienced lawmakers, with a concluding statement reiterating the claim (*That's why U.S. Congressional lawmakers shouldn't have a term limit*). The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*Here are my 3 reasons why* and *I agree with that statement based off the*). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*If you constantly having; your going have; laws that protects; exprienced; lawmakers who has; feild; power, and unable; Thats why*) that hinder comprehension.

Should U.S. Congressional lawmakers have term limits? U.S. Congressional ~~lawmakers~~ Should have term limits because it wouldn't make much sense to let them run for as long as they want making awful decisions, or make a big corruption somewhere.

If someone was in the U.S. Congressional law for their entire life they may take it upon themselves to do what they want without the consult of anyone else. They may make life threatening decisions. For example in ~~text 3~~ ~~lines 9-10~~ ~~text 3~~ paragraph 2 it states "at least some of them will have to think more carefully" Meaning if they were to ruin a society with a horrible law they wouldn't ~~be~~ and won't get re-elected. And someone would think how bad it is and try to change it to something better. Some people may argue that having a term limit is ~~unjust~~ and unruled. They say this because they think that if you ~~are~~ already in office what's the point in staying there for 3 years (if you're lucky) then getting kicked out because your term is over? While the president serves 4 years? In text 4, paragraph 2 and 3 lines 10-16 states "limiting the number of terms of members could serve would: 1-Take power away ~~from~~ voters... And 2-Severely decrease Congressional from"

Capacity." Meaning if you ~~do a~~ 3 year term system then your gonna lose your voters and your Congress Capacity will gradually go down. To me I think just because your Congress Capacity goes down, doesn't mean you can't always elect someone new. And your gonna get more voters. Even if your term has a limit. ~~There will always~~ be voters. In text 2 paragraph 1 lines 1-4 it states that "The ancient Greek and Roman democracies provided us with many lessons to learn- and sometimes re-learn. One we definantly failed to learn ~~is~~ the importance of govermental term limits, and for the very reason Greek and Romans enacted term limits: to Control Corruption". This is saying that since the Greeks and Romans were ~~not~~ using a term limitation, they were keeping corruption at bay. This doesn't mean they got rid of it completely, it just means they kept it low so that it wouldn't hurt the citizens.

Having a term limit for congressional lawmakers seems like a GREAT idea. It would limit the time for a certain law as well and keep bad decisions to a low.

### **Anchor Level 3–C**

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*U.S. Congressional lawmakers SHOULD have term limits because it wouldn't make much sense to Let them run for as long as they want*). The essay demonstrates confused or unclear analysis of the texts (*They may make life threatening desicions and just because your Congress Capasity goes down, doesnt mean you can't allways elect Someone new. And your gonna get more voters*), insufficiently distinguishing the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some people may argue that having a term limit is unjust and unruling...whats the point in staying there ... then getting kicked out*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*at least some of them will have to think more carefully*” and “*limiting the number of terms of members could serve would: 1- Take power away from voters ... And 2- Severly decrease Congressional capasity*”). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes that are sometimes miscopied and paragraphs cited are inaccurate (*in text 3 lines 9-10 paragraph 2 ... some of them will have to and In text 4, paragraph 2 and 3 lines 10-16 State “limiting the number of terms of members could serve ... Severly decrease Congressional capasity”*). The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, by introducing a reasonable claim in favor of term limits, followed by a large paragraph of support and ending with a paragraph that reiterates the claim (*Having a term limit for Congressional Lawmakers seems like a GREAT idea*). The essay lacks a formal style (*then getting kicked out because your term is over and your gonna lose*), using some language that is imprecise (*unjust and unruling, your for “you’re”, keep bad dicisions to a low*). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*would’nt, sence, disicions, Life they, severly, capasity, graduatlly, allways, completely*) that hinder comprehension.

There should be term limits in the United States for Congress. It would help bring new ideas to the table. It would also help keep the new people from being uninterested or corrupt.

In the first text it shows that it would help bring new ideas by saving the legislative process. It would benefit from fresh blood and ideas. This shows that they would benefit by having term limits because they would have new ideas and would be in more up-to-date government.

If there were term limits it would cycle young to new people. The old people that are in office now will become uninterested and won't care to do a good job. Term limits should be in place to put new people in office and to help the old people to not get uninterested.

## **Anchor Level 2–A**

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*There should be term limits in the United States for congress. It would help bring new ideas to the table*). The essay demonstrates confused or unclear analysis of the texts (*If there were term limits it would cycle through to new People. the old people that are in office now will become uninterested and won't care to do a Good Job*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (“*the legislative process would benefit from fresh blood and ideas*” *this shows That they would benefit by having term limits because they would have...more Up to date Goverment and term limits should...help the Old people to not Get uninterested*). The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, identifying a single text (*In the first text it shows*). The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information, introducing a claim in favor of term limits to *help bring new ideas* and to *keep The new people from being uninterested or corrupt*, providing a supporting piece of evidence and summarizing how term limits would provide *new ideas*, in the first body paragraph, attempting to support the idea that term limits will *cycle the old people* out of office before they lose interest in a second body paragraph and concluding with a summation to create a mostly coherent essay. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*It would also help keep The new people from being uninterested, In the first text it shows that it would, won't care to do a Good Job*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors (*Bring; saying “the; benefit; ideas” this shows; Goverment; limits it; cycle; wont; Good Job term*) that make comprehension difficult.

I believe there shouldn't be limit on senators work time. But they should limit what they can do and have a bunch of people to watch them and follow them to be sure they not illegal.

The limit should not be by time working it should be on what they do and their power. They should still make laws and taxes but other people should read everything first so they don't go against the constitution.

Text I say wisdom from long experience means senators with no limit are smarter cause they done a lot more and are more educated. Means they have "fresh ideas" cause they smarter.

Like other parts of the government hasn't limit because some senators should be removed but by the people. Every member should be watched and if their job is going good they should stay. As long as he likes or until they are corrupt.

So, only long terms if senators are approved by a bunch of people like judges them. Even the Supreme Court says me first!

## **Anchor Level 2–B**

The essay introduces a claim (*I believe their shouldnt be limit on senators work time*). The essay demonstrates a confused analysis of Text 1 (*senators with no limit are smarter cause they done alot more and are more edjivated*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (*wisdom from long experience ... Means they have “fresh ideas” and other parts of the goverment hasnt limit*). The response demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, using three references from Text 1 (*Text 1 say*), one identified only by quotation marks (“*fresh ideas*”), and a third unidentified as coming from a text (*the Supreme Court say*). The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay. The essay opens with a paragraph that introduces a negative claim but immediately shifts the focus to the idea that senators should be limited as to *what they can do* and the need to have *a bunch of poeple wach them*, followed by three body paragraphs that fluctuate between the two ideas, presenting a series of loosely-connected sentences in an attempt to support each, and concludes with a two-sentence paragraph that references both of the initial unrelated claims (*So, only long terms if senators are approved by a bunch of poeple who judge them. Even the Supreme Court say no limit!*). The essay lacks a formal style, using language that is sometimes inappropriate and imprecise (*their* for “there”, *a bunch of, there* for “they’re”, *smarter cause they done alot, parts of the goverment hasnt limit, job is going good*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*wach, shure, working it, frist, dont, constatushun, Text 1 say wisdom, edjivated, removed but, good they, corrpt*) that make comprehension difficult.

Yes, Should U.S. congressional lawmakers have term limits? Because other people have to take that job of the person work in the U.S. congressional they have to give to the opportunity in the U.S. congressional. I believe the U.S. congressional lawmakers should have term limits because other people is want to new job for give more benefit to the congressional lawmakers in us..

The U.S. congressional lawmakers I have term limits because the people are They need the opportunity. According to the text 1#, "At the federal level, the Articles of Confederation, adopted in 1781, set term limits for delegates to be the continental congress - the equivalent of the modern congress - mandating that no person shall be of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years." This mean is the people is working in the congressional is have to living is sex year because the give the opportunity for other people working. In my opinion, this benefit for the people because they can have new job.

## **Anchor Level 2–C**

The essay introduces a claim (*I believe the U.S congressional lawmakers should have term limits because other people is want to new Job*). The essay demonstrates confused and unclear analysis of Text 1, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*This mean is the people is workenig in the congressional is have to libing is sex year because the give the oportunity for other people working*). The essay presents little evidence from the texts, using only one quote (“*At the federal leval, the Articles of confederation, adopted in 1781, set term limits ... mandating that no person shall be of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of sex years*”). The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes, citing only one text with no line numbers (*According to the text 1#*) and miscopying some of the quote that was used. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay by presenting one paragraph that introduces the claim, followed by one paragraph that inadequately supports the claim (*the give the oportunity for other people working*), and concluding with a summative sentence (*I my opinion, thas benefist for the people because they can have new job*). The essay uses language that is predominantly incoherent (*Because other people I have to take that job of the person worke in the U.S congressional; people is want to new Job; have to libing; because the give*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*congressinal, worke, oportunidit, belive, for give more benefist, people are They need, This mean is, the people is*) that make comprehension difficult.

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – A

Do I think the government should have limits?  
Absolutely, without ~~and~~ any rules/regulations they can do anything they want. Our Government could turn teranical very fast if we start opening doors that should be concreat walls.. It happened in many country around the world Already.  
Our Gov could alter our Constitution, strip our rights to bare arms, freedom of Speech & religion if we dont keep the checks and ballences in place that stop them from doing exactly that. We have rules in place in almost all aspects in our lives. If you cant follow them you're consitered to be someone who is not a functioning member of society. These rules should be followed by everyone, from the bottom to the top of the domoninc hyarchy or everything could and most likley will crush and burn VERY FAST.

### Anchor Level 1-A

The essay introduces a claim but the claim does not address the task (*Do I think the goverment should have limits? Abslutly. Without any rules/regulations they can do anything they want*). The essay does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the texts. The essay does not make use of citations. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay consisting of one paragraph of supporting arguments on the need for limits on government; however, it is not relevant to the task. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure. (*It happened in many country around the world Already*). The essay demonstrates emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*goverment, Abslutly, teranical, concreat, many country, ballences, consitered, functining, hyarchy, and most likley will*) that do not hinder comprehension. The essay is a personal response, making no reference to the texts, and can be scored no higher than a 1.

---

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – B

---

U.S. Congressional term limits is  
the topic. A topic that should  
allow for people that qualify to run  
as many times as they would like.

---

### Anchor Level 1-B

The essay does not introduce a direct claim but states only that the “*topic should allow for people that qualify to run as many times as they would like.*” The essay does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the texts. The essay does not make use of citations. The essay is minimal, making assessment of coherence, organization, and style unreliable. The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

## Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

Congressional lawmakers have shaped the U.S. and the people in it for many years. Due to the people, who vote for candidates for this job, lawmakers have helped solve issues within the US. This job is hard, and takes great minds and wisdom to be good at, but there should be limits to how long Congressional lawmakers should be able to serve.

Corruption has been a problem all around the world in the practices of lawmaking. Corrupt lawmakers could easily hurt the people of the US instead of helping make the country safer. Members of congress that make laws are easily susceptible to corruption because "the power and influence gained by being a member of congress for a long period of time tempt lawmakers to base their votes and policies on their own self-interest, instead of those of the people." (text 1, lines 28-30) This corrupt behavior of people in office would simply limit the effectiveness of our government.

Although wisdom is gained through experience, term limits will still allow for great, honest minds to be part of our lawmaking system.

Fresh minds in office may have less experience, but are more accustomed to what the people want and need in the country today.

Great minds such as Benjamin Franklin

---

## Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

---

and Thomas Jefferson both "announced their favor of term limits. And a limit of three years for serving in Continental congress..." (text 2, lines 9-10) Recently in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, term limits have not been practiced at all, setting up a seniority system within the government. These representatives have served many years in office and may be not giving the people exactly what we need." Enactment of term limits will destroy the current seniority system and force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more conscientious, representatives into our congress." (text 2 lines 33-34) Even though the elders of Congress have experience, "What's the point of making people learn so much in law school if we don't put them in office?"

Another reason that lawmakers should have term limits is to make them feel more obligated to follow all the laws and realize the impact of these laws. Some politicians have been in office for 30+ years and may not realize just how much ordinary people are affected because of their higher status. "When politicians know they must return to ordinary society and live under the laws passed while they were in government, at least some of them will think more carefully about the

---

## Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

---

long term effects of the programs they support.”  
(Text 3 lines 8-11) This will lead to a more thoughtful and aware system of lawmaking, allowing US citizens to know they are in good hands.

Congressional lawmakers have difficult jobs, and laws passed can backfire easily. Because of this, experience is needed in office, but experience should still allow for new, fresh ideas and people. Lawmakers for congress should have term limits when they join the Government.

---

---

## Part 2 – Practice Paper – B

---

Many of our US founders were educated in the classics and were familiar with the Greek and Roman practice of office rotation to limit corruption.

---

In the United States there has been a long running debate on whether there should be congressional term limits. Many people believe there should be term limits, and many believe there shouldn't. There are reasonable arguments for both sides. However, Congressmen should not have term limits as any perceived benefits will not outweigh the negatives when instituting term limits.

There are several arguments as to why term limits should not be established. It has been proven that they do not necessarily eliminate corruption and that they can force the removal of effective lawmakers. The truth is that term limit policies will do little to stop political corruption from occurring. According to Casey Burgat, "Studies regularly find that many of the corruptive, 'Swampy,' influences advocates contend would be curtailed by instituting term limits are, in fact, exacerbated by their implementation" (Text 4, lines 58-61). As seen in this excerpt, it is said that the implementation of term limits will have the opposite effect of the desired intention. Term limits will not stop corruption, they will only feed it. Corruption is not an overnight phenomenon and, with the constant turnover of Congressmen, there will be no one to "see the whole picture" over a period of time and to expose the corruption and work at eliminating it. If enacted, this system will also have the negative impact of removing competent

Congressmen from office. Burqat also backs this up when he says, "No matter how knowledgeable or effectual a member may be in the arduous tasks of writing and advancing legislation, term limits would ensure that his or her talents will run up against a strict time restriction -- Doesn't it make more sense to capitalize on their skills, talents and experience, rather than forcing them to the sidelines where they will do their constituents, the public and the institution far less good?"<sup>4</sup> (Text 4, lines 46-52). As stated, this law would do nothing except force good lawmakers to retire, replacing them with new, less experienced and, therefore, less competent ones. This would create a less efficient Congress filled with less talented congressmen at any given time.

Another reason why congressional term limits shouldn't happen is because that kind of policy is undemocratic. Yes, the United States is not a true democracy, but it is still based on democratic values, and this term limit suggestion is undemocratic. This law would severely limit the rights and choices the voters have when it comes to choosing elected officials. Robert Longley supports this when he writes, "Term limits would actually limit the rights of the people to choose their elected representatives. As evidenced by the number of incumbent lawmakers reelected in every midterm election, many Americans

truly like their representative and want them to serve for as long as possible" (Text 1, lines 45-48). Thus, establishing term limits would be the first step in removing peoples democratic rights when choosing their representatives. Term limits would not allow them to reelect candidates they have been pleased with because of the good work they have been doing. This is further supported by Burgoa when he writes, "Perhaps the most obvious consequence of establishing congressional term limits is that it would severely curtail the choices of voters. A fundamental principle in our system of government is that voters get to choose their representatives. Voter choices are restricted when a candidate is barred from being on a ballot" (Text 4, lines 11-15). These quotes reinforce how the enactment of term limits would lead to the loss of democratic rights. Such a policy would not only limit the freedom of choice for voters in electing their representatives, but it would also take away the freedom of those who wish to continue to represent and work for the betterment of their country, but are being locked out from the ballot because their "time is up".

Some people believe that term limits should be implemented because it will bring in fresh ideas and can limit corruption. Langley writes of how "Any organization—even Congress—thrives when fresh new ideas are offered and encouraged.

The same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation" (Text 1, lines 35-37).

However, this ignores the true value of experience. What good are new ideas coming in every few years if no one is staying on to carry them out? The longer a representative is in office, the more he or she learns about the issues and the process and the more effective he or she can become.

Also, Lawrence Reed suggests term limits are necessary because "legislators ultimately control the purse and the power to control bureaucrats any time they want to, and we must not overlook the unholy alliances built up between bureaucracies and long term legislators" adding that "the 'experience' of living as a private citizen ... is just as valuable and instructive, if not more so, than cooking up those rules and taxes in the first place" (Text 3, lines 27-31). I beg to differ. Legislators are also private citizens when they go home and are living under their laws like everybody else. Also, there is quite a process and necessary layers of understanding that goes into "cooking up those rules" which, again, calls for experience.

Term limits for our Congressmen should not be introduced. The negatives out weigh any positives that could come from them. It is important that we have experienced legislators to address problems of corruption and to learn the "ins and outs" of the system so meaningful alliances and legislation can occur. As Robert Longley puts it, "Yes, term limits would

---

Part 2 – Practice Paper – C

---

help eliminate some of the corrupt, power-hungry and incompetent lawmakers, but it would also get rid of the honest and effective ones" (Text 2, lines 55-57). Having no term limits allows voters to vote out the bad legislators, while also allowing them to keep those lawmakers they approve of in office.

---

through life in the government they always want to do some change in the whole today country. one of the changes is the term limits. they said that this would improve congress us should congressional lawmakers have term limits. Because term limits would actually limit the right of the to choose their elected representatives. another reason is ~~Because~~ term limits would help eliminate some of the corrupt.

U.S should congressional lawmakers have term limits. Because term limits would actually limit the Right of the to choose their elected representatives. according to this in text I says that "Lawmakers reelected in every midterm election, many Americans truly like their representative and want them to serve for as long as possible". this means that a lot of the americans ~~the~~ people are ~~undemocratic~~ undemocratic.

U.S should congressional lawmakers have term limits. Because term limits would help eliminate some of the corrupt. according to this in text I says

that term limits would help eliminate power hungry and incompetent lawmakers, but it would also get rid of all the honest and effective ones" this means that they would throw out the ~~baby~~ baby with the ~~bath~~ bathwater.

Some people think that us should not congressional lawmakers have term limits because perhaps the most obvious consequence of establishing congressional term limits is that it would severely curtail the choices of voters. this is not right because they can not limit the votes for ~~that~~ select the president.

In conclusion us should congressional lawmakers have term limits ~~because~~ the ~~term~~ states one reason that support this is that term ~~limits~~ limits would help eliminate some of the corrupt. another reason that support ~~this~~ my position is that term limits would actually limit the right of the to choose their electe ~~representatives~~ representatives

A big topic in today's news is term limits for congress. As of right now you can serve in the congress for however you want to. But what if that changed. What if there were term limits, would we benefit from it.

Having term limits can be good and bad. Term limits will give others the opportunity to change something and make it better. Having term limits can prevent corruption. (Text 2)

Staying with no limits can cause that congress member to get a better education about his/her job and become better. (Text 1) Experience is valuable when doing those jobs.

People should be free to elect whomever they want. (Text 3). ~~Term limits~~ congress is a hard job so to find someone with experience and who is good at it. They should stay as long as possible because they are good at it.

Term limits are a bad idea. The people get to elect the congress so you can vote for who you want to win and keep them there for as long as you want them there.

**Practice Paper A – Score Level 4**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4.

**Practice Paper B – Score Level 0**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 0.

**Practice Paper C – Score Level 6**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 6.

**Practice Paper D – Score Level 2**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2.

**Practice Paper E – Score Level 3**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 3.