

# **FOR TEACHERS ONLY**

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

**ELA**

## **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

**Tuesday, August 16, 2022—8:30 to 11:30 a.m., only**

### **RATING GUIDE**

Updated information regarding the rating of this examination may be posted on the New York State Education Department's web site during the rating period. Check this web site at <http://www.nysesd.gov/state-assessment/high-school-regents-examinations> and select the link "Scoring Information" for any recently posted information regarding this examination. This site should be checked before the rating process for this examination begins and several times throughout the Regents Examination period.

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

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### **Mechanics of Rating**

#### **Scoring the Multiple-Choice Questions**

For this exam all schools must use uniform scannable answer sheets provided by the regional scanning center or large-city scanning center. **If the student's responses for the multiple-choice questions are being hand scored prior to being scanned, the scorer must be careful not to make any marks on the answer sheet except to record the scores in the designated score boxes. Marks elsewhere on the answer sheet will interfere with the accuracy of the scanning.**

Before scannable answer sheets are machine scored, several samples must be both machine and manually scored to ensure the accuracy of the machine-scoring process. All discrepancies must be resolved before student answer sheets are machine scored. When machine scoring is completed, a sample of the scored answer sheets must be scored manually to verify the accuracy of the machine-scoring process.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Rating of Essay and Response Questions

- (1) In training raters to score student essays and responses for each part of the examination, follow the procedures outlined below:

#### *Introduction to the Tasks*

- Raters read the task and summarize it.
- Raters read the passages or passage and plan a response to the 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 holistic scores (i.e., by matching evidence from the response to the language of the rubric and by weighing all qualities equally).
- 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 practice papers individually. Raters should score the five papers independently without looking at the scores provided after the five papers.
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel comfortable enough to move on to actual scoring. (Practice papers for Parts 2 and 3 only contain scores, not commentaries.)

- (2) When actual rating begins, each rater should record his or her individual rating for a student's essay and response on the rating sheets provided in the *Information Booklet*, not directly on the student's essay or response or answer sheet. Do *not* correct the student's work by making insertions or changes of any kind.
- (3) Both the 6-credit essay and the 4-credit response must be rated by at least two raters; a third rater will be necessary to resolve scores that differ by more than one point. **Teachers may not score their own students' answer papers.** The scoring coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the movement of papers, calculating a final score for each student's essay or response, and recording that information on the student's answer paper.

**Schools are not permitted to rescore any of the open-ended questions on any Regents Exam after each question has been rated the required number of times as specified in the rating guide, regardless of the final exam score. Schools are required to ensure that the raw scores have been added correctly and that the resulting scale score has been determined accurately.**



## New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts

### Part 2 Rubric

#### Writing From Sources: Argument

Criteria	6 Essays at this Level:	5 Essays at this Level:	4 Essays at this Level:	3 Essays at this Level:	2 Essays at this Level:	1 Essays at this Level:
<b>Content and Analysis: the extent to which the essay conveys complex ideas and information clearly and accurately in order to support claims in an analysis of the texts</b>	-introduce a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task  -demonstrate in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task  -demonstrate thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a precise claim, as directed by the task  -demonstrate appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a reasonable claim, as directed by the task  -demonstrate some analysis of the texts, but insufficiently distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a claim  -demonstrate confused or unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-do not introduce a claim  -do not demonstrate analysis of the texts
<b>Command of Evidence: the extent to which the essay presents evidence from the provided texts to support analysis</b>	[4]  -present ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis  -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material  -exhibit skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay	-present ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis  -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material  -exhibit logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay	-present ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis  -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis  -demonstrate inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present ideas inconsistently and/or inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant  -demonstrate little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present little or no evidence from the texts  -do not make use of citations
<b>Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the essay logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language</b>	-establish and maintain a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure	-establish and maintain a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure	-establish and maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure	-exhibit acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay  -establish some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay	-exhibit inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay  -establish but fail to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure	-exhibit little organization of ideas and information  -are minimal, making assessment unreliable  -use language that is predominantly incoherent, inappropriate, or copied directly from the task or texts
<b>Control of Conventions: the extent to which the essay demonstrates command of conventions of standard English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</b>	-demonstrate control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language	-demonstrate control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language	-demonstrate partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension	-demonstrate emerging control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that hinder comprehension	-demonstrate a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult	-are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable  -use language that is inappropriate or imprecise

- An essay that addresses fewer texts than required by the task can be scored no higher than a 3.
- An essay that is a personal response and makes little or no reference to the task or texts can be scored no higher than a 1.
- An essay that is totally copied from the task and/or texts with no original student writing must be scored a 0.
- An essay that is totally unrelated to the task, illegible, incoherent, blank, or unrecognizable as English must be scored a 0.

The idea of setting term limits for members of our modern day Congress has repeatedly surfaced over the years, with some individuals feeling that it is an ineffective, if not harmful, practice to allow ~~such~~ lawmakers the opportunity to remain in office for years on end. While there has been precedent for such practice dating back to the 1781 Articles of Confederation, setting term limits could actually prove more harmful to our democratic ideals and to our nation's legislative success. Thus, it is in our national interest to retain our present system and not hold our Congressional members to term limits.

Present studies show that over one hundred lawmakers have served thirty-six years or more (Text 2, lines 25-26). Proponents of term limits claim this can only lead to corruption and stagnation. They note that those lawmakers serving over an extended number of years may be tempted "to base their votes and policies on their own self-interest, instead of those of the people" (Text 1, lines 29-30) and favor special interests that support them, rather than the national populace as a whole. Bringing in "fresh blood" on a regular basis, they point out, allows for fresh ideas and prevents the practice of "always do what you've always done" (Text 1, line 37). They further claim that this change in policy would support our democratic ideals as "term limits have been approved

almost everywhere they've been on a ballot" (Text 3, line 32).

On the contrary, setting term limits would be a step towards the dissolution of our democratic rights. As noted in Text 3, "opponents charge that... people should be free to elect whomever they want and that voters inherently have the power to limit terms simply by voting incumbents out" (Text 3, lines 12-14). Opponents further contend that bringing in all new individuals every few years removes the element of experience which is an extremely valuable asset when it comes to functioning effectively and successfully in the political system. They note that "crafting legislative proposals is a learned skill" (Text 4, lines 18-19). Being in office over a period of time allows the lawmaker to learn how the system works, and to make connections and bonds that will allow for more effective policy making. As Corey Burgtat points out, "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?" (Text 4, lines 50-53). The experience and the bonding in itself can easily lead to new conversations and perspectives that will prevent stagnation. And, in reality,

There will be those who are replaced with "fresh blood" when an incumbent retires or is democratically voted out. Thus, not having term limits allows for a blend of new ideas and years of experience which makes for an even more powerful and effective legislative system.

When all is said and done, it should be realized that the idea of setting term limits for our Congressional lawmakers should be put to rest. As a democracy, we should allow our nation's citizenry to decide who should be representing them and for how long as they feel their representative is successful in doing so. With our system free of legislative term limits, more diversity within a mix of the "new" and the "old" can only result in a more fair and effective system overall.

## **Anchor Level 6–A**

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*While there has been precedent for such practice dating back to the 1781 Articles of Confederation, setting term limits could actually prove more harmful to our democratic ideals and to our nation's legislative success. Thus, it is in our national interest to retain our present system and not hold our Congressional members to term limits*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Opponents further contend that bringing in all new individuals every few years removes the element of experience which is an extremely valuable asset when it comes to functioning effectively and successfully in the political system*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Proponents of term limits claim this can only lead to corruption and stagnation*). The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*They note that those lawmakers ... may be tempted "to base their votes and policies on their own self-interest, instead of those of the people" and "opponents charge that... people should be free to elect whomever they want and that voters inherently have the power to limit terms simply by voting incumbents out"*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 1, lines 29-30*) and (*Text 4, lines 18-19*)]. The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, first introducing the issue and a claim that opposes term limits, then presenting the rationale for the counterclaim focusing on concerns over *corruption and stagnation*, followed by a rebuttal to these concerns using arguments that support the claim (*On the contrary, setting term limits would be a step towards the dissolution of our democratic rights and The experience and the bonding in itself can easily lead to new conversations and perspectives*), concluding with a reaffirmation of the claim. The response establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*Bringing in "fresh blood" on a regular basis, they point out, allows for fresh ideas and prevents the practice of "always do what you've always done" and When all is said and done, it should be realized that the idea of setting term limits for our Congressional lawmakers should be put to rest*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

When the United States Constitution was adopted in 1789, there were no limits set on the tenures of elected officials. Since its adoption, the Constitution has grown to include the amendment that limits the term of the presidency ~~to six years~~ (this coming after President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected to four terms, breaking the tradition established by George Washington of a two-term presidency). However, there ~~is~~ is not an amendment that limits the term of service of Congressmen and women. Although some may argue that Congressional terms of service should not be limited because this would take power from the people in deciding who is to hold office, this statement is faulty. <sup>and ultimately incorrect.</sup> Congressmen should have their terms limited because they will be more likely to serve ~~the people rather than seeing~~ <sup>Special interest</sup> for their own wishes come true; new Congressmen will bring new ideas to ~~the~~ both houses, and corruption will be limited.

If Congressmen had their terms of service limited, they would be more inclined to serve the people ~~and~~ because of the mindset that their position is not permanent. Lawrence W. Reed writes that, "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 long-term effects of the programs they support" (Text 3 I. 8-10). Reed argues that if term limits were established, Congressmen would think more carefully before supporting certain legislation because they know they will have to live under those laws when their term is over. They will therefore be more inclined to serve the interests of the people, not their own political interests, because they will soon be part of "the people". Robert Longley writes that Congressmen should serve as an official "for noble reasons and a true desire to serve the people" (Text 1 II.33-34). If term limits were set, officials would run because they want to serve the people, not to hold on to a prestigious and well-paying job.

Setting term limits on Congressmen would also allow for new ideas in Congress and, therefore, progress. Darrell Berkheimer details a statistic that says that in the past thirty years, those elected into Congress "have been re-elected 80 and 90 percent of the time" (Text 2 I.29). This continued re-election of officials means there is little room for new ideas and proposals to infiltrate the legislative branch. Longley asserts it simply: "the same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation" (Text 1 I.36-37). When individuals hold office for lengthy periods of time, it is seemingly impossible for new and

perhaps improved proposals to find their way into congressional discussions. Term limits would allow a new wave of new ideas for an ever-changing and-developing America.

Finally, congressional term limits would limit governmental corruption. Longley posits that limits to tenure would "help prevent corruption and reduce the influence of special interests" (Text 1 1. 30-31). These special interest groups have a specific political goal they want to see achieved. Therefore, they will bribe Congressmen to see that legislation favorable for themselves, rather than for the general population, ~~is~~ is passed. ~~Set~~ Terms limits for Congressmen would rid <sup>Congress of</sup> these corrupt officials, who would likely ~~be~~ continued to be re-elected because of the influence of these interest groups. Additionally, ~~also~~ ~~members~~ ~~of~~ Congress members should work for the benefit of the entire nation, "not only the constituents in their home state" (Text 2 1. 37). Voters in a certain state ~~may~~ or are inclined to continue to elect an official who is working for the benefit of their state, this may be at the expense of the nation as a whole. Limits to congressional tenure would prevent the interests of a sole group or state from hindering the advancement of the entire nation.

Term limits should be placed on members of the United States Congress. These limits would

lead officials to truly serve the people, rather than themselves. The limits would also allow fresh ideas to enter into Congress while ridding Congress of corrupted officials. It is true that the Constitution does not specifically set term limits for Congressmen. ~~However,~~ Nonetheless, an amendment was made to limit the president's tenure. Therefore, an amendment to the Constitution should be made to limit congressional terms of service, reflecting ~~as~~ a ~~changing~~ ~~society~~ progressive and advancing society that is ready ~~to do~~ and willing to advance.

## **Anchor Level 6–B**

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*Congressmen should have their terms limited because they will be more likely to serve the people rather than seeing their own wishes come true; new Congressmen will bring new ideas to both Houses, and corruption will be limited*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*If term limits were set, officials would run because they want to serve the people, not to hold on to a prestigious and well-paying job and When individuals hold office for lengthy periods of time, it is seemingly impossible for new and perhaps improved proposals to find their way into congressional discussions*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. (*Although some may argue that Congressional terms of service should not be limited because this would take power from the people in deciding who is to hold office, this statement is faulty and ultimately incorrect and Voters in a certain state are inclined to continue to elect an official who is worthy for the benefit of their state. This may be at the expense of the nation as a whole*). The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Lawrence W. Reed writes that, “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 long-term effects of the programs they support” and Longley asserts it simply: “the same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation”*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*(Text 3, l. 8-10) and (Text 1, l. 30-31)*]. The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an introductory paragraph that presents the issue and an opposing view that leads to a rebuttal that establishes the claim, followed by three body paragraphs of support that focus on how term limits can allow for Congressmen to *be more inclined to serve the interests of the people*, for new people to bring in *new ideas* and how they can *limit governmental corruption*, and a concluding paragraph that reaffirms the claim (*Therefore, an amendment to the Constitution should be made to limit congressional terms of service, reflecting a progressive society that is ready and willing to advance*). The response establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*Darrell Berkheimer details a statistic; This continued re-election of officials means there is little room for new ideas and proposals to infiltrate the legislative branch; The limits would also allow fresh ideas to enter into Congress while ridding Congress of corrupted officials*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*to serve ... rather than seeing; will therefore be; Congressmen ... an official; years, those*) only when using sophisticated language.

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 5 – A

Throughout recent years in United States history, the discussion of whether U.S. Congressional lawmakers <sup>should</sup> have term limits has been a heated and divisive one. Some argue for it, while others argue against it. However, Congressional lawmakers should have term limits, as it would prevent large amounts of corruption, bring in lawmakers with fresh ideas, and it would bring about the end of unfair advantages.

U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits because it would prevent large amounts of corruption from within the political system. According to Text 1, lines 28–30, "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." In essence, the effect of having a member of Congress stay in power for far too long could potentially result in special interest groups and personal greed getting in the way of what he or she was elected to do in the first place; serve the people.

Another reason to impose term limits on Congressional lawmakers would be that it would kickstart a resurgence of fresh ideas. According to Text 2, lines 33–34, "Enactment of term limits will destroy the current seniority system and force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more conscientious, representatives into our Congress...." This shows that by putting term limits in place, it will be easier to elect lawmakers that are able to bring new and productive ideas to the table and are able to carry out and pass laws that are more relevant to the time.

Lastly, U.S. Congressional lawmakers should face term limits because it would bring about the end of unfair advantages in Congress. According to Text 3,

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 5 – A

lines 15 - 18, "... large numbers of citizens feel that a political system without limits is a stacked deck. Any system that allows incumbents to amass so much power and attention in office that challengers can rarely win is surely in need of a corrective." What this represents is the concerns of the majority of voters whom feel that a Congress without term limits is an unfair advantage over lawmakers that want to bring about a current change in the system and have a much more minimal chance of being elected, due to an elected individual amassing large amounts of power over the years that they have served.

However, there are opponents of term limits that challenge these claims. Text 1, lines 45 - 46, state that the process is undemocratic and "... would actually limit the rights of the people to choose their elected representatives." This is a fair point, but on the contrary, it would limit the amount of power that a lawmaker could amass and destroy reigning dynasties of corruption in turn. In addition, Text 4, lines 36 - 37, state that the process will "limit incentives for gaining policy expertise" in that "lawmakers" will face less pressure to develop expertise on certain issues." This also brings about a decent point. However, the limited time span would only place more pressure on lawmakers to develop expertise in the field and get their ideas out there as fast as possible. On top of that, somewhat limiting the amount of expertise could also limit the potential amount of corruption from donors, self-interest groups and personal gain of lawmakers.

In conclusion, the United States should carry out term limits onto Congressional lawmakers. This is necessary, as it would instill quotas to prevent corruption from outside sources and personal greed, make it possible

---

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 5 – A

---

for current lawmakers to be elected and bring about new ideas, and take away the unfair advantages that come with serving for life. However, others argue that it is unconstitutional and takes away power from voters. But in truth, setting up term limits on lawmakers would only give more power to voters by giving them more options and disallowing lawmakers to set up a stacked deck through a term without limits.

### Anchor Level 5-A

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Congressional lawmakers should have term limits, as it would prevent large amounts of corruption, bring in lawmakers with fresh ideas, and it would bring about the end of unfair advantages*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This shows that by putting term limits in place, it will be easier to elect lawmakers that are able to bring new and productive ideas to the table and are able to carry out and pass laws that are more relevant to the time*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However, there are opponents of term limits that challenge these claims*). The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*The power and influence gained by being a member of Congress ... tempt lawmakers to base their votes and policies on their own self-interest; Enactment of term limits will ... force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more conscientious representatives into our Congress ...”; large numbers of citizens feel that a political system without limits is a stacked deck ... surely in need of a corrective*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 2, lines 33-34) and (Text 1, lines 45-46)]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an introduction that presents the issue and a claim that favors term limits, followed by three paragraphs of support focusing on the arguments that they would prevent large amounts of corruption, would kickstart a resurgence of fresh ideas, it would bring about the end of unfair advantages in Congress, a fourth paragraph that presents and refutes the counterclaim, and concludes with a reiteration of the claim and the arguments that were addressed. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*Throughout recent years in United States history, the discussion of whether U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits has been a heated and divisive one and it would instill quotas to prevent corruption from outside sources and personal greed, make it possible for current lawmakers to be elected and bring about new ideas, and take away the unfair advantages that come with serving for life*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (place; serve; whom feel; elected, due; onto Congressional) only when using sophisticated language.

There has been much debate ever since the creation of the United States and its Constitution about whether Congress ~~should~~ members should have term limits. ~~members~~ It has resulted in actions by lawmakers themselves and also advocacy from citizens. Term limits can ~~stop~~ lessen corruption, but at the cost of other honest and good lawmakers too. Therefore, congressional term limits should not be instituted because they are unconstitutional and take power away from the people.

The Constitution itself does not provide for there to be any congressional term limits. In fact, in the case of U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, the Supreme Court declared them unconstitutional. The court ruled that, "the states could not impose congressional term limits because the Constitution simply did not grant them the power to do so." (Text 1, lines 14-15). If states were allowed to impose term limits, there would be different qualifications for each state (Text 1, line 17). There would be no uniformity in the requirements for elections and term limits. The state legislatures simply do not have enough powers for those cases.

Term limits would also limit the more experienced and knowledgeable lawmakers to a shorter time. Congress members need that experience to guide them through the process of creating legislation that applies to the whole nation. If those experienced legislators are pushed out of office because of term limits, then they will be robbed

of the opportunity to change our nation and its laws for the better. They will not be able to use the power and renown they have for improving the country. Older members of Congress also have established relationships with members from other parties, and they can use those relationships to their advantage. If term limits did exist, they would lose these connections and the newer members of Congress would have to build those relationships again (Text 1, lines 58–63).

In "Five Reasons to Oppose Congressional Term Limits," Casey Burgard said that, "Being on the job allows members an opportunity to learn and navigate the labyrinth of rules, precedents and procedures unique to each chamber." (Text 4, lines 24–25) He argued that members of Congress need time to learn the process and be able to serve the people in the best way possible. Lawmaking is a difficult and time-consuming process, and members of Congress need time to navigate it. Freshmen members of Congress would need even more to learn how everything works without the help of older and more experienced members. Thus, term limits are just not practical.

However, there are certainly strong arguments for term limits. One of the most dominant are that they will help decrease corruption within the system. It is argued that, "enactment of term limits ... will force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 5 – B

Conventions, representatives into our Congress. (Text 2, lines 33-34)"

While that may be true, the corrupt members are a fraction of all of the members of Congress.

Term limits is too drastic of a measure. They will push out honest lawmakers who could do the job well.

Term limits for members of Congress are simply not practical. They push out experienced and honest lawmakers and are not constitutional.

They should not be instituted in our government.

### Anchor Level 5-B

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Term limits can lessen corruption, but at the cost of other honest and good lawmakers too. Therefore, congressional term limits should not be instituted because they are unconstitutional and take power away from the people*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*If those experienced legislators are pushed out of office because of term limits, then they will be robbed of the opportunity to change our nation and its laws for the better and Lawmaking is a difficult and time-consuming process, and members of Congress need time to navigate it*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However, there are certainly strong arguments for term limits*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*the states could not impose congressional term limits because the Constitution simply did not grant them the power to do so and Older members of Congress also have established relationships with members from other parties, and they can use these relationships to their advantage*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 1, lines 14-15) and (Text 4, lines 24-25)]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay with an opening paragraph that introduces the issue and establishes a claim, followed by a paragraph that focuses on the role of the Constitution as it relates to term limits, two paragraphs that support the claim that *term limits are just not practical* and a paragraph that addresses an opposing claim, ending with a summative conclusion. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*The Constitution itself does not provide for there to be any congressional term limits and There would be no uniformity in the requirements for elections and term limits*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language (*ruled that, "the states; so." (Text 1, lines 14-15). If; One ... are*).

For years, the issue of imposing term limits on congress members has been debated. U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits for multiple reasons. The most important reasons that support this are that term limits would limit corruption, bring in fresh ideas and mindsets to the legislative body, and it would force congress members to think more about morals than money and their next campaign.

Imposing term limits would drastically decrease the amount of corruption in the legislative body. "The power and influence gained by being a member of Congress for a long ~~time~~ period of time tempts lawmakers to base their votes and policies on their own self interest, instead of those of the people." (Text 1, lines 28-30) This means that if members of Congress were to be forced out of office, they wouldn't focus on helping themselves, but rather what the people value.

The next, and most important reason that term limits should be imposed on congress members is that it would bring new ideas and mindsets into the legislative body. "The same people holding the same seats for years leads to stagnation." (Text 1, lines 36-37) This means that as the culture and lifestyles around the U.S. continue to modernize, legislation will not because traditional congress members will still be in power. "... we have had 110 congress members who served 36 or more years. And seven served for more than 50 years ago." (Text 2, lines 25-26) To put

this into perspective, you would need to think back to what was happening 40-50 years ago. This is before 9/11, before our first black president, before all of the advancements of rights for LGBTQ members, a time where kids were still hit in schools, and "ducking and covering" would protect you from nuclear war during the cold war. The point I'm trying to make is that the U.S. can't have congress members that don't reflect the average American.

The last reason that congress members should face term limits is that it would subsequently shorten the amount of time they use for fundraising and campaigning. "Constantly fearing reelection, members of congress feel pressured to devote more time to raising campaign funds, than to serving the people." (Text 1, lines 40-41) This means that instead of lawmakers thinking about how to get into office again and again, they will think about policies to pass. "they would think more about the good of their states and country, and less about their next campaign." (Text 3, lines 34-35). Some argue that, "The longer you do a job, the better you get at it." (Text 1, lines 50) However, once somebody makes up their mind about something, it's hard to persuade them the other way. Imposing term limits would bring new lawmakers into the legislative body with fresh ideas.

In conclusion, term limits would greatly improve the U.S. as a whole and congress members' lives too. Imposing term limits on members of congress would limit corruption, bring in fresh ideas and it would

---

## **Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 5 – C**

---

force them to think more about their morals, and lawmaking rather than their next campaign.

---

### **Anchor Level 5–C**

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits for multiple reasons ... term limits would limit corruption, bring in fresh ideas ... and would force Congress members to think more about morals than money and their next campaign*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This means that as the culture and lifestyles around the U.S. continue to modernize, legislation will not because traditional congress members will still be in power and This means that instead of lawmakers thinking about how to get into office again and again, they will think about policies to pass*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some argue that, “The longer you do a job, the better you get at it.” ... However, once somebody makes up their mind about something, it’s hard to persuade them the other way*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*“The power and influence gained by being a member of congress for a long period of time tempts lawmakers to base their votes and policies on their own self interest, insted of those of the people” and “Constantly facing reelection, members of congress feel pressured to devote more time to raising campaign funds, than to serving the people”*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 1, Lines 36-37) and (Text 2, Lines 25-26)]. However, there are minor errors in the material quoted from the texts (*tempts* for “tempt”, *seats* for “seat”, *years ago*). The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay with an opening paragraph introducing *multiple reasons* for imposing term limits, followed by three body paragraphs, each of which addresses one of the introduced reasons. The second body paragraph devotes much of its development to knowledge gained outside the text and incorporates first and second person references. There is a separate summative conclusion. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*The next, and most important reason that term limits should be imposed on congress members is that it would bring new ideas and mindsets into the legislative body and To put this into perspective*) despite the use of *you* and *I*. The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*people.” (Text 1, lines 28-30) This; important reason; sombody ... their mind; awhole; lives too; morals, and lawmaking*) only when using sophisticated language.

Whether or not U.S. congressional lawmakers should have term limits has been a subject of debate for many years. It is brought up every time Congress does something to upset the citizens of the United States. Term limits were mandated under the Articles of Confederation, but were dropped when the Constitution was ratified. Although some believe that term limits decrease corruption, due to them being undemocratic and the need to have experience in Congress, U.S. lawmakers should not have term limits.

Term limits are not democratic. They actually limit the right of the people to choose the representative they want in Congress. Based on the number of officials who get reelected during each midterm election, it can be seen that most Americans truly like who they put in office and they want them to be able to serve for a long time (text 1, lines 45-48). Also, if term limits were set, the choices of candidates that voters have would be severely restricted. A large piece of the way the government works is the fact that voters get to choose their representatives, but if candidates had term limits, voters' choices would be diminished as soon as some of them were no longer allowed to be on the ballot (text 4, lines 11-15). Term limits should not be allowed for U.S. congressional candidates because it restricts the rights of the voters to choose who they want to serve.

In addition to that, being a member of Congress takes experience. It takes time to build and gain the trust and respect from the civilian population to show that they can be an effective leader. This would be restricted if term limits were put in place. New members would no longer be able to reach their full potential with this job because by the time they start to get it down, their term will be up and they will not be allowed back. It takes time to improve at this job, and new members would face a large learning curve coming into the job (text 1, lines 50-54). Experience is one of the most important parts of this job, and that would be taken away with term limits. Text 4 describes how "crafting legislative proposals

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 4 – A

is a learned skill; as in other professions, experience matters" (Text 4, lines 18-19). It takes a lot of time to be able to learn how to do this, but it takes on the job experience. Being a congressman is not something that one can learn ~~to~~ and perfect how to do prior to having the job, and if term limits were set in place no one would be able to do their job to the extent that they want to.

~~Some people may think the opposite~~

There may be some people who believe that having term limits reduce corruption. They believe that after being a member of Congress for an extended amount of time, lawmakers tend to base their choices and policies on self-interest as opposed to the interest of the people. Those in favor of term limits believe that corruption will occur less with term limits because elected officials will not be in office for as long so they will have less opportunities to promote their own interests (Text 1, lines 28-31). Although that may be true, it is also true that new members of Congress will not have control over the permanent bureaucracy. People will not have the trust in them that they would if it was someone who had been in office for an extended amount of time (Text 3, line 26). Also, new members are more likely to defer to people who have been there longer, even if it is just by a year or two. Although ~~some~~ believe it may reduce corruption, an unbalance of power would still be visible because more experienced members would consolidate power over new members (Text 4, lines 29-33). Some may say that having term limits would reduce corruption, but in fact it would not because new members would defer to more experienced people anyway.

Since term limits are not democratic and it takes time and experience to be good at this job, U.S. ~~lawmakers~~ should not have term limits, despite some saying they may reduce corruption. This has been a topic of discussion for many years, but ultimately the decision needs to be made that U.S. congressmen <sup>should</sup> ~~do~~ not have term limits.

## **Anchor Level 4–A**

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Although some believe that term limits decrease corruption, due to them being undemocratic and the need to have experience in Congress, U.S. lawmakers should not have term limits*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*if candidates had term limits, voters choices would be diminished* and *Experience is one of the most important parts of this job, and that would be taken away with term limits*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some may say that having term limits would reduce corruption, but in fact it would not because new members would defer to more experienced people anyway*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Based on the number of officials who get reelected during each midterm election, it can be seen that most Americans truly like who they put in office and they want them to be able to serve for a long time and It takes time to improve at this job, and new members would face a large learning curve coming into the job*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 1, lines 45-48) and (Text 4, lines 18-19)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, first introducing some history of term limits and both the counterclaim and a negative claim, followed by a paragraph that addresses term limits as being *not democratic*, a paragraph that focuses on how *being a member of Congress takes experience*, and another paragraph that presents and refutes the counterclaim, ending with a summative conclusion (*This has been a topic of discussion for many years, but ultimately the decision needs to be made that U.S. congressmen should not have term limits*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*Also, if term limits were set, the choices of candidates that voters have would be severely restricted*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*them being, who they put, office and they, place no one ... their, democratic and it*) that do not hinder comprehension.

The U.S Congress is a big part of the government. Limiting their terms would only negatively effect the government. Therefore, U.S. Congressional lawmakers should not have term limits.

First, limiting their terms would force the old and more experienced people out of the government. According to the text it states, "Without long-term legislators, according to another anti-term-limit argument, 'inexperienced' legislators won't be able to control the permanent bureaucracy," (Text 3, lines 25–26). This shows how "new comers" would only hurt the government, and it's better for more experienced members to stay. It's important for more experienced people remain in Congress and serve long terms. According to the text it states, "We've gained from long experience as essential to the continuity of government" (Text 1, line 27). This shows how a working Congress needs people who have been in the job for a long time.

Secondly, our government is based on the people's vote and who they want to serve. According to the text it states, "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 the ballot," (Text 4, lines 13–15). This shows how limiting terms on congress would also affect what ~~the~~ the government was based on, the people's vote.

Also, friendships among the congress members would greatly improve how well they work with each other. According to the text it states, "Trusts and friendships among members across party lines are essential to progress on controversial legislation" (Text 1, lines 59–60). People tend to work better and more efficiently with their peers. Friendships take a while to form.

Limiting terms prevents them from happening which could affect productivity.

Some people, on the other hand believe term limits prevent corruption in the government.

According to the text it states, "Term limits would help prevent corruption and reduce the influence of special interests" (Text 1, lines 30–31). In reality, term limits worsen corruption in ~~the~~ Congress.

According to the text it states, "These studies regularly find that many of the corruptive, 'swampy' influences advocates content would be curtailed by instituting term limits are, in fact, exacerbated by their implementation" (Text 4, lines 59–61). This shows how limiting terms would only affect the government for the worse.

Overall, term limits should not be added for the U.S. Congress because it limits ~~experience~~, limits the people's vote, and affects how they work together, which could negatively affect the government. If there are no term limits for congress the system and people would greatly benefit from it.

## **Anchor Level 4–B**

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Limiting their terms would only negatively effect the government. Therefore, U.S. Congressional lawmakers should not have term limits*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This shows how “new comers” would only hurt the government, and it’s better for more experienced members to stay and Also, friendships among the Congress members would greatly improve how well they work with eachother*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some people, on the other hand believe term limits prevent corruption in the government*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*wisdom gained from long experience as essential to the continuity of government*” and “*Term limits would help prevent corruption and reduce the influence of special interests*”). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 3, lines 26-25) and (Text 1, line 27)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay with an opening paragraph that introduces the claim, two paragraphs that support the claim, followed by a paragraph that presents and refutes a counterclaim (*In reality, term limits worsen corruption in congress*), ending with a summative conclusion that reaffirms the original claim (*If there are no term limits for congress, the system and people would greatly benefit from it*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*First, limiting their terms would force the old and more experienced people out of the government and Overall, term limits should not be added for the U.S. Congress because it limits experience, limits the people’s vote, and affects how they work together*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*According to the text it states; along; accross; on the other hand believe; together, which*) that do not hinder comprehension.

The U.S. Congressional lawmakers having or not having term limits is a widespread debate in our society. The U.S. congressional lawmakers should have term limits because there are many pros of having limited terms that overall, outweigh the cons.

There are many positive factors to having term limits. One reason is that you will have new, fresh ideas. After one has served many terms, you tend to have many of the same ideas reoccurring and you never really seem to get any new ways or ideas. In Text 1, it states, "The same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation." (lines 36 + 37). This is basically saying that having the same person over and over could lead to little maybe even no progression over time.

Although many people agree that having term limits is a positive, there are also many people that argue that there should not be term limits. There are many different reasons that people feel there shouldn't be term limits such as having the power of the people who vote being taken away from them. When there are term limits, people say that their choice of who they want to vote is being taken

away because a person they want is limited. Text 4 says, "Voter choices are restricted when a candidate is barred from being on the ballot." (lines 14 + 15). Another ~~other~~ reason people say there should not be term limits is that when people have been doing that job longer, they are more experienced and know what they are doing. Lines 50, 51, and 52 in text 1 state, "Lawmakers who have earned the trust of the people and proven themselves to be honest and effective leaders should not have their service cut short by term limits." This shows that after time, these people gain trust and loyalty and want them to keep being elected, but with term limits, they only can for a short amount of time.

For many years, people in congress would be elected over and over to where some have ran for over 50 years. In some cases, this could have some positives but overall there are many negatives. In text 2 it says, "Enactment of term limits will destroy the current seniority system and force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more conscientious, representatives into our congress..." This is saying how when you have term limits, it forces new people to be chosen that can bring in many new and fresh ideas and things that can overall benefit in one's nation. Text 3 says, "They want to

lines  
33 + 34

open the system to more people from a variety of professions." (lines 36 + 37).

When every once in a while, a new person is elected, it ensures there will always be new ideas, new experiences, people with different skills, etc. coming in to help the nation.

Overall, you can see that although there are pros to having no limits on terms, there are far more pros with having term limits that outweigh the pros of not having them.

#### Anchor Level 4-C

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*The U.S. congressional lawmakers should have term limits because there are many pros of having limited terms that overall, outweigh the cons*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This is basically saying that having the same person over and over could lead to little maybe even no progression over time and when you have term limits, it forces new people to be chosen that can bring in many new and fresh ideas*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Although many people agree that having term limits is a positive, there are also many people that argue that there should not be term limits*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*The same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation*” and “*Voter choices are restricted when a candidate is barred from being on the ballot*”). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*(In Text 1 ... lines 36 & 37) and (Text 4 says ... lines 14+15)*]. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay with an opening paragraph that introduces the claim, a second paragraph that supports the need for term limits to foster *new, fresh ideas* followed by a third paragraph discussing a counterclaim but never refuting it, then two paragraphs of support for the claim, and a brief conclusion that reaffirms the original claim (*there are far more pros with having term limits that outweigh the pros of not having them*), while shifting from third to second person throughout. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*There are many positive factors to having term limits; you never really seem to get any new ways or ideas; For many years, people in congress would be elected over and over to where some have ran for over 50 years*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors [*U.S. congressional; that overall; After one ... you; stagnation.*] (*lines; experienced; benefit in one's nation*] that do not hinder comprehension.