

FOR TEACHERS ONLY

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

CCE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (Common Core)

Monday, January 26, 2015—9:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., only

SCORING KEY AND RATING GUIDE

Mechanics of Rating

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.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/> 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 (Common Core). 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 (Common Core)*.

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. The scoring key for this exam is provided below. **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.

Correct Answers				
Part 1				
1 1	6 3	10 3	15 3	20 4
2 4	7 4	11 4	16 4	21 1
3 2	8 1	12 2	17 1	22 3
4 1	9 2	13 3	18 2	23 4
5 1		14 1	19 1	24 2

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.



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)

Part 2 Rubric

Writing From Sources: Argument

Criteria	6	5	4	3	2	1
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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -introduce a claim -demonstrate confused or unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	Essays at this Level: -do not introduce a claim -do not demonstrate analysis of the texts
Command of Evidence: the extent to which the essay presents evidence from the provided texts to support analysis	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -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	Essays at this Level: -present little or no evidence from the texts -do not make use of citations
Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the essay logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language	Essays at this Level: -exhibit skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure	Essays at this Level: -exhibit logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure	Essays at this Level: -exhibit acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay -establish and maintain a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure	Essays at this Level: -exhibit some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay -establish but fail to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure	Essays at this Level: -exhibit inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay -lack a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate or imprecise	Essays at this Level: -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
Control of Conventions: the extent to which the essay demonstrates command of conventions of standard English grammar, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling	Essays at this Level: -demonstrate control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language	Essays at this Level: -demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language	Essays at this Level: -demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension	Essays at this Level: -demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension	Essays at this Level: -demonstrate a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult	Essays at this Level: -are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable

- 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 as a 0.

People have often dreamed about bringing extinct creatures back to life, as is often seen in futuristic sci-fi movies, books, and other media. This fantasy, however, is soon to become a reality due to the power of biotechnology and a process that researchers call "de-extinction." This idea has been gaining popularity recently, largely because of the implications it gives off: humans have come so far as to be able to essentially revive what have been determined as permanently dead species. Many scientists and common people alike have been latching on to this idea as it is becoming more and more of a reality. However, what many people fail to realize is that de-extinction might not be the best idea. Bringing extinct species back to life will potentially cause many different problems, including the mutation of ecosystems, the revitalization of archaic diseases, and the increase of apathy towards currently endangered species. Of course, there are research benefits and the overall miraculousity of the whole process, but in summation, the idea is not favorable to the human society of today.

Many people think that bringing back extinct species would cause a shift for the better in the health of our environment, as they would restore it to its original state. In text 2, lines 31-39, it is argued that the return of the woolly mammoth to Siberia would help to bring the land back to grassy steppes from the current tundra. However, this is likely not to be the case. Since ecosystems have evolved with the creatures that live there, it is doubtful to think that the revived species would even survive there in the first place, with new predators and prey.

As stated in Text 4, lines 9-20, even if scientists are able to reconstruct a species, it is an enormous feat to rebuild the original habitat from where the species originally came. There is the option of producing and breeding these species in captivity, but at that point, there really is little to no reason to reintroduce the species in the first place. It is morally unjust to recreate these creatures specifically for the purpose of research and entertainment, and releasing them back into the wild will just create problems for the creatures and the environment alike.

The issue of reviving species also begs the question of the negatives that are brought along with it: what will these creatures bring? If they do manage to survive in some new habitat, there is always the possibility that some new disease or illness might spread and will further destroy the world's ecosystem. Similarly to the impacts of the Columbian Exchange on the Native Americans, these new, or old, diseases could cause the mass destruction of the human population. These creatures could possibly restart an illness that has gone extinct over time that we do not have an immediate vaccine for, or could do something similar to the plants and animals around them. There is the possibility of new research stemming from this revitalization, but not without a large threat along with it.

Researchers have also yet to consider the psychological impacts that come with de-extinction. If we are to bring

back only extinct species with great success, then what is the point of even protecting endangered species in the first place? Also, if the destruction of the natural habitats of some species are the reason for its extinction, then what good is it to stop ruining those environments if we can just bring back the species? In Text 3, lines 34-37, this concept is detailed: Simply recreating a species takes away from what was originally the problem in the first place. De-extinction does not solve the problem, it just skirts around it. What people really need to be focusing on is not fulfilling a science-fiction fantasy, but is conserving the ecosystems that we are currently destroying. Reviving fallen species will only create a bigger issue: growing apathy.

The thought of bringing back an extinct species is something that was previously only thought to be a futuristic fantasy, and was left to the sci-fi producers of the world. However, as science and research advances, people start to get increasingly greedy and apathetic. The problem of extinction cannot simply be solved through de-extinction; it must be solved through both revived but first precaution and conservation.

Anchor Level 6–A

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task, noting that while the *fantasy* of de-extinction *is soon to become a reality, de-extinction might not be the best idea, and de-extinction is not favorable to the human society of today*. The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims, stating that *it is morally unjust to recreate these creatures specifically for the purpose of research and entertainment, and releasing them back into the wild will just create problems for the creatures and the environment*. The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully (*Since ecosystems have evolved with the creatures that live there, it is doubtful to think that the revived species would even survive there in the first place, with new predators and prey; there is always the possibility that some new disease or illness might spread and will further destroy the world's ecosystem; Simply recreating a species takes away from what was originally the problem*), making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Bringing extinct species back to life will potentially cause many different problems, including the mutation of ecosystems, the revitalization of archaic diseases, and the increase of apathy towards currently endangered species*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material (*in Text 2, lines 31-39 and in Text 3, lines 34-37*). The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, declaring opposition to de-extinction, identifying areas of concern, addressing identified claims put forth in support of de-extinction, and then countering them through a discussion of *the health of our environment, the world's ecosystem, the psychological impacts that come with de-extinction*. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*People have often dreamed about bringing extinct creatures back to life, as is often seen in futuristic sci-fi movies, books, and other media and the issue of reviving species also begs the question of the negatives that are brought along with it*) with few exceptions (*miraculousity and similarly*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

Since the beginning of time, humans have been strategically shaping the world so that they may not only survive, but also prosper. Plants, animals, and the earth itself are continually used for human benefit. Over time, this attitude that mankind is free to manipulate the world in its favor has become detrimental to the environment. Entire species that once thrived have been destroyed at the hands of the humans. With science advancing, it is now feasible that these species could be revived. Though it may seem to be an incredibly heroic venture, bringing back extinct species is just another example of humans attempting to control and manipulate the world. De-extinction is an irresponsible idea that will only create more environmental issues.

The idea is irresponsible in many ways, the first being that its motives are corrupt. Scientists seem to care more about the magnitude of this feat, should it be achieved than actually saving extinct species. They are most concerned ~~that~~ with the "scientific and technological challenges" this would conquer (Text 1, lines 17-18). Furthermore, some believe that bringing back species that ~~have~~ ~~been~~ ~~made~~ were made extinct due in part to human actions would "make up for the wrong" done upon the species (Text 1, lines 25-26). Surely anyone who could successfully execute this plan would be hailed as a genius and a hero, but scientists are so blinded by this, they fail to recognize ~~how~~ ^{how} unrealistic it is. They would have to create at least a million* animals in order to have a sustainable species (Text 4, lines 13-15). Additionally, they would need a place for all of these animals to live. Keeping them in a zoo would be a waste and obviously only beneficial to humans. However, many of their natural habitats and food sources no longer exist (Text 3, lines 17-20). To try to bring animals back

into existence without plans to address these issues would just make more problems.

Another potentially negative result of de-extinction would be a disruption to the current environment. Species have learned to live without these extinct animals, so reintroducing them and off setting the balance that has developed would be problematic. What's more, "previously benign organisms could become pests in new environments" (Text 4, lines 24-25). They may carry viruses that humans are not prepared to deal with. Finally, spending money and ~~the~~ time on this would compete with the efforts to prevent extinction and otherwise preserve our natural world (Text 3, lines 40-44).

The only way to truly save the earth is for humans to let go of their control on the environment. If we stop manipulating and destroying the earth far less species will disappear. De-extinction, though an innovative concept, is far too problematic to be carried out. It is our responsibility to stop interfering with nature, rather than constantly trying ~~to~~ fix it.

Anchor Level 6-B

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*Though it may seem to be an incredibly heroic venture, bringing back extinct species is just another example of humans attempting to control and manipulate the world. De-extinction is an irresponsible idea that will only create more environmental issues*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims [*Furthermore, some believe that bringing back species that were made extinct due in part to human actions would "make up for the wrong" done upon the species (Text 1, lines 25-26). Surely anyone who could successfully execute this plan would be hailed as a genius and a hero, but scientists are so blinded by this, they fail to recognize how unrealistic it is*]. The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis [*However, many of their natural habitats and food sources no longer exist (Text 3, lines 17-20) and Finally, spending money and time on this would compete with the efforts to prevent extinction and otherwise preserve our natural world (Text 3, lines 40-44)*]. The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 4, lines 13-15)]. The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, first stating that *this attitude that mankind is free to manipulate the world in its favor has become detrimental to the environment*, then presenting information to show how de-extinction is *irresponsible, unrealistic, and problematic*, and concluding by stating that *it is our responsibility to stop interfering with nature, rather than constantly trying to fix it*. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*Since the beginning of time, humans have been strategically shaping the world so that they may not only survive, but also prosper*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

Our world has changed significantly since the pre-historic age. The environment we have today is very different from that when *Tyrannosaurus rex* flourished. The idea of de-extinction sounds exciting and fascinating but with changes in the world's ecosystems, it's not such a great idea. Species have grown and developed so much that bringing back past life forms wouldn't help ~~those~~ those currently living or those "de-extincted" to move on or create new life. The best way to move our society forward is through conservation, not de-extinction.

Text 2, *Bringing Them Back to Life*, describes various scientists ~~who~~ who become "increasingly excited" when they discuss their research and realize that "De-extinction is now within reach" (Lines 10-16). Some scientists see de-extinction as a way to "help make up for the wrong of the extinction," which human habits caused (Text 1, lines 24-26). Some scientists hold that de-extinction will help preserve "wild plant species, which are also vulnerable to extinction" and may be valuable to the pharmaceutical industry (Text 2, lines 29-31). In addition, extinct animals ~~made~~ made vital services in their certain ecosystems 12,000 years ago, which may benefit with their return. However, there's no evidence that bringing these animals back will help their ecosystems today. They've changed since these animals have gone extinct. How do we know that the consequences of bringing these animals back won't harm their ecosystems? Or drastically change the way other animals live today? As Text 1 states, species conservation not de-extinction is the most effective way to address the problem of extinction (lines 30-38).

Text 3, *The Case Against Species Revival*, explains how

de-extinction plans to bring back "single ~~one~~ charismatic species" while ignoring millions of other living creatures in danger of becoming extinct (lines 7-8). Lines 19-24 show the reader the thought of if we do bring back extinct animals, and put them back in their natural habitats, will they just be hunted to extinction again? Text 3 also raised the question, "what changed in their original habitat that may have contributed to their extinction in the first place?" (lines 26-27) If we bring them back just to be extinct again, then aren't we just wasting time and ~~our~~ money? The text states that "the expectation that biotechnology can repair the damage we're doing to the planet's biodiversity" is "harmful" (Text 3, lines 28-30). I agree with Text 3, "Conservation is about finding alternative, sustainable futures for peoples, for forests, and for wetlands" (lines 48-49).

Text 4, The Case Against De-Extinction: It's a Fascinating but Dumb Idea, ~~one~~ adds information against the thought of de-extinction. Lines 3-8 state how it would be ~~more~~ more sensible to spend the time and money into preserving species and preventing them from ~~extinction~~ extinction. Then the text explains how some extinct animals no longer have their natural food source because that as well, is extinct (lines 18-20). With the way our world is changing we can't just bring ^{back} an old species and expect them to fit right in back to their normal routine. They would change with the world's changes just like they did before, to produce new organisms and other species. We can't expect everything to stay the same as it once was. Text 4 gives the reader examples and ideas against de-extinction.

De-extinction is a ~~one~~ fascinating idea and sounds exciting but can have harmful affects on the way we live now

and on our future. No one can predict the true outcome of what de-extinction could do. Texts 2, 3, and 4 show different sides of the issue and raise open-ended questions to which no one has the answer for. De-extinction is not a good idea, and I believe that conservation, not de-extinction, should be the way to move our world forward.

Anchor Level 5–A

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Species have grown and developed so much that bringing back past life forms wouldn't help those currently living or those "de-extincted" to move on or create new life*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*However, there's no evidence that bringing these animals back will help their ecosystems today. They've changed since these animals have gone extinct*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims [*As Text 1 states, species conservation not de-extinction is the most effective way to address the problem of extinction (lines 30-38)*]. The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully (*With the way our world is changing we can't just bring back an old species and expect them to fit right in back to their normal routine. They would change with the world's changes just like they did before to produce new organisms and other species*), making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*if we do bring back extinct animals, and put them back in their natural habitats, will they just be hunted to extinction again?* and *If we bring them back just to be extinct again, then aren't we just wasting time and money?*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*(Text 1, lines 24-26)* and *Text 3 also raised...(lines 26-27)*]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, first introducing the claim against de-extinction, proposing conservation instead. The first supporting paragraph addresses the opposing claim and the second and third supporting paragraphs analyze and support conservation as preferable to de-extinction. The essay concludes with a strong repetition of the claim (*conservation, not de-extinction, should be the way to move our world forward*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*The best way to move our society forward is through conservation, not de-extinction*). The essay demonstrates control of the conventions exhibiting occasional errors (*florished; perserve; Or drastically change the way other animals live today?; that as well; worlds changes*) only when using sophisticated language.

The process "de-extinction" is the ability to clone extinct species using biotechnology and DNA samples from the past. De-extinction is supported by "many conservationists, geneticists, and biotechnologists" (Text 1, line 4). However, having a Jurassic Park mentality ~~when~~ when it comes to resurrecting ~~and~~ dead species is both naive and shortsided. "It is much more sensible to put all limited resources for science and conservation into preventing extinctions" (Text 4 lines 3-4) than it is to rely solely on the outlandish resource that is de-extinction.

The idea that one can simply bring a species back from the dead and face no repercussions is impractical and foolish. When determining the life of a certain species or organism, one has to keep in mind the many factors that affect it. Norman Plants' "absence from the wild is more easily fixed than the absence of animals, for which de-extinction is usually touted." (Text 3 lines 15-16). For example, "the passenger ~~bird~~ pigeon is often mentioned as a target for de-extinction" (Text 4 lines 11-12). Although seemingly a good idea, the passenger pigeon's main food source is the American chestnut which is also basically extinct. When deciding whether or not to recreate ecosystems of formerly extinct organisms, the topic of plant life and climate is often not considered. ~~The~~ Resources and organisms go hand in hand and ~~often~~ when reintroducing species to formerly unknown environments, the extinction of existing organisms is put at risk.

Another million dollar question when deciding whether or not ~~the~~ ~~beneficial~~ de-extinction is ^{beneficial} ~~good~~ is: "where do we put them?" (Text 3, lines 19-20)

If one simply puts a formerly extinct animal into the wild they are jeopardizing the risk of the organism being hunted. ~~and~~ A formerly extinct animal will (understandably) cause ~~and~~ awe and amazement within its global community. Not only are extinct animals at risk of being a pretty reward for hunters, they also risk dying for the exact same reason they did before. Like stated ~~before~~, not only will the passenger pigeon not be the American chestnut, it will also be thrown into a transformed habitat that will be "completely unrecognizable in a century" (Text less than a century (Text 4 line 20) because of human's pollution and deadly greenhouse gases. In order to truly protect a formerly extinct organism ^{one} ~~they~~ must ~~be~~ conserved ^{it} in zoos or research communities which is unnecessary time and effort. Also, one can argue that ~~forcing~~ ~~an animal~~ preventing an animal from being "free" is hardly reason to "de-extinct" it at all.

Lastly, and the most important reason to disagree with "de-extinction" is ~~the~~ that it is a lazy solution to a ^{consistent} ~~constant~~ problem. "Conservation is about ~~the~~ ecosystems finding alternative, sustainable futures for peoples, for forests, and for wetlands." (Text 3 lines 48-49). De-extinction "will" reduce the ~~effect~~

urgency with which we address the causes of extinction." (Text 1 lines 34-35) De-extinction makes scientists and government officials seem like "heroes" that are bettering the world, however, in their efforts they are simply putting a small band-aid on an already huge wound. ~~Worse~~ The goal shouldn't be to "take back" the damage, but to preventing more damage from happening. ~~again~~. "By tackling causes of demise: habitat destruction, climate disruption, pollution, overhunting..." (Text 4, lines 4-5) ~~we~~ the world will become a safer, better place for all organisms.

It is a foolish, short-sided idea to bring previously extinct animals into a world that fails to properly shelter the animals already in it. Many animals are already endangered and ~~decreasing~~ ^{nearing} extinction. ~~Priority~~ priority should be to those organisms, not new ones.

Although de-extinction seems outlandish, wonderful, and "good", it is not. De-extinction ~~process~~ is "far-fetched, financially problematic, and extremely unlikely to ~~occur~~ succeed on a planet continually being vastly transformed by human actions" (Text 4, lines 22-23). ~~Yes~~ It isn't good to recreate the past, and although it seems like a good idea, extinct animals should stay extinct.

Anchor Level 5–B

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*having a Jurassic Park mentality when it comes to resurrecting dead species is both naïve and shortsided*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Resources and organisms go hand in hand and when reintroducing species to formerly unknown environments, the extinction of existing organisms is put at risk*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*De-extinction makes scientists and government officials seem like “heroes” that are bettering the world, however, in their efforts they are simply putting a small band-aid on an already huge wound*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis [*it will also be thrown into a transformed habitat that will be “completely unrecognizable in less than a century” (text 4 line 20) because of human’s pollution and deadly greenhouse gases and De-extinction will “reduce the urgency with which we address the causes of extinction” (text 1 lines 34-35)*]. The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources [(*text 1, line 4*) and (*text 3 lines 15-16*)] to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, starting with an introductory paragraph that defines de-extinction and states a claim and counterclaim. Each of the three supporting paragraphs addresses an aspect of the counterclaim and then refutes it (*The idea that one can simply bring a species back from the dead and face no repercussions is impractical and foolish and Lastly, and the most important reason to disagree with “de-extinction” is that it is a lazy solution to a consistent problem*). The conclusion appropriately sums up the essay (*although it seems like a good idea, extinct animals should stay extinct*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*When determining the life of a certain organism, one has to keep in mind the many factors that affect it and Also, one can argue that preventing an animal from being “free” is hardly reason to “de-extinct” it at all*). The essay demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*repercussions; absence; one... they; world, however*) only when using sophisticated language.

Science and technology have made major advancements in genetics in the last 10 years. As a result, scientists everywhere are coming closer and closer to the ability to genetically "de-extinct" previously extinct species. This, however, raises a lot of controversy. There are many arguments both for and against "de-extinction." The main question asked is, "Should extinct species be brought back into existence?"

One could easily agree that extinct species should be brought back into existence. The benefits of the use of this technology would clearly outweigh the negatives. In Text 1 (lines 26-28), it says, "... biotechnologies and techniques involved can be used to help conservation biologists in their efforts to preserve highly endangered species." In addition, in Text 1 (lines 28-29), it says, "For example, it could be used to help increase the genetic diversity of small populations or those in captive breeding programs." Both of these points are valid. Not only would de-extinction help to preserve highly endangered species, but it would also help to protect smaller populations from going extinct. This would help to ensure that the populations of endangered animals would stay high enough so that extinction would never occur in the first place. In Text 2 (lines 25-27) it says, "And especially in recent years we humans were the ones who wiped them out, by hunting them, destroying their habitats, or spreading diseases. This suggests another reason for bringing them back..." In addition, Text 2 (lines 28-29) says, "Other scientists that favor de-extinction argue that there will be concrete benefits. Biological diversity is a storehouse of natural invention." Both of these points made in Text 2

are very important. Since we wiped many of the recent extincted animals out because of our own actions, it should be our responsibility to bring them back and restore what we have damaged ourselves. Also, there are other "concrete" benefits in de-extinction. Among these are the restoration of natural wildlife and the restoration of natural wildlife diversity. This would further benefit the ecosystem and help to repair what we have damaged as humans.

Although some people may argue that the negatives outweigh the benefits; this is not true. In Text 3 (lines 19-20), it says, "Where do we put them?" Text 3 (lines 17-18) also says, "A resurrected Pyrenean ibex will need a safe home, not just its food plants." This however is not true. If species were de-extincted in mass numbers and placed into an environment, they would be able to survive. This is because a species can adapt to an environment over a relatively short period of time. Although a great number of the species might die at first, certain ones will survive and reproduce. In Text 3 (lines 26-27) it also says, "what changed in their original habitat that might have contributed to their extinction in the first place." This is true that the environment may have changed where the species used to live, but scientists must take into consideration what their original environment was like and place de-extincted species in them. This would ensure that the de-extincted species would live on rather than die out.

"De-extinction" is the result of numerous science and technological benefits within the last 10 years. These

advancements have finally made it near possible to "bring back" species that went extinct within the last 10,000 years. The benefits of the use of this type of technology would greatly outweigh the "negative" side effects. The benefits include the increasing of diversity and the resurrection of species that we caused to become extinct most recently and species that benefit us through medical purposes. The negatives are said to be that there would be nowhere for "de-extincted" species to live. This, however, can be solved if scientists study the habitats of extinct species and place them in a similar environment or somewhere where they can easily adapt to their surroundings and grow in great numbers.

Anchor Level 5-C

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Not only would de-extinction help to preserve highly endangered species, but it would also help to protect smaller populations from going extinct*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This would help to ensure that the populations of endangered animals would stay high enough so that extinction would never occur in the first place and This would further benefit the ecosystem and help to repair what we have damaged as humans*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Although some people may argue that the negatives outweigh the benefits; this is not true*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Since we wiped many of the recent extincted animals out because of our own actions, it should be our responsibility to bring them back and restore what we have damaged ourselves and Among these are the restoration of natural wildlife and the restoration of natural wildlife diversity*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources [*In Text 2, (lines 25-27) and (In Text 3, lines 26-27)*] to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material. This essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, by first raising the question regarding the use of de-extinction, then providing evidence and analysis to support de-extinction, followed with a discussion of the opposing claims and concluding with a detailed summary of the argument (*The benefits include the increasing of diversity and the resurrection of species that we caused to become extinct most recently and species that benefit us through medical purposes*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*One could easily agree that extinct species should be brought back into existence and Although a great number of the species might die at first, certain ones will survive and reproduce*). The essay demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors (*existence, recent extincted animals, benefits; this is, This however is*) that do not hinder comprehension.

The idea of being able to bring back extinct species is, although interesting, improbable and a waste of time. This is primarily because the species that are extinct, are extinct for a reason. Survival of the fittest is the cause for a lot of cases of extinction but, also human interaction ~~is~~ has caused numerous cases of extinction.

Putting time and money toward de-extinction sounds noble but, will end up being a waste. This is because people forget to think about the causes of extinction for these species. Most of the species that are now extinct have died out because of some sort of disruption in their habitat or ~~the~~ climate they ~~the~~ would thrive in. These are essential to their survival and as the earth ages, the habitats and climates change too. Recreating ~~a~~ species may sound cool, but once a species is created, their ability to survive is dependent on ~~how~~ how well they can integrate into a habitat. If the habitat that they are meant to survive in does not exist then, there will not be survival. Instead of putting time and money toward de-extinction people should be working on trying to stop extinction from happening by preserving habitats and keeping pollution down (Text 4, 3-5). ~~By~~ By doing this, a much larger number of species will be saved than the amount that would result from de-extinction.

Not only would de-extinction be a waste of resources but, also the effects from it ~~a~~ would

be much more complicated than anticipated for example, once a species is resurrected, their habitat that they once lived in would also need to be ~~re~~ created for them to live in (text 3, 4-6). Also, alot of these ~~animals~~ species ~~would~~ may end up living in captivity instead of in the wild. This would end up being very costly and potentially controversial. This ~~be~~ said, ~~the~~ use of de-extinction could potentially be used to preserve endangered species from extinction (text 2, 41). Putting effort into this would be a better use of resources because some of the species ~~is~~ that are endangered struggle to reproduce.

Anchor Level 4–A

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*The idea of being able to bring back extinct species is, although interesting, improbable and a waste of time*). The response demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*This be said, the use of de-extinction could potentially be used to preserve endangered species from extinction*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Instead of putting time and money toward de-extinction people should be working on trying to stop extinction from happening by preserving habitats and keeping pollution down*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with paraphrased material [(Text 4, 3-5) and (text 3, 4-6)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay with an opening paragraph that states the claim, followed by two body paragraphs focused on habitat destruction (*If the habitat that they are meant to survive in does not exist then, there will not be survival*) and habitat renewal (*their habitat that they once lived in would also need to be created for them to live in and alot of these species may end up living in captivity*). The conclusion addresses the counterclaim (*the use of de-extinction could potentially be used to preserve endangered species from extinction*) to further the claim by identifying it as a better use of resources. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*Not only would de-extinction be a waste of resources but, also the effects from it would be much more complicated than anticipated*). The essay demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors (*alot; extinction but; extinction people; anticipated for example*) that do not hinder comprehension.

Bringing already extinct species back to life is not a good idea. ~~De-extinction wouldn't be a smart thing to~~ Text 3 The Case Against Species Revival and Text 4 The Case Against De-Extinction: It's a Fascinating but Dumb Idea help prove that de-extinction is a bad idea.

De-Extinction poses many threats to the environment and to society. Organisms that once were on ~~the~~ Earth are gone for a reason and would not be able to adapt well to Earth now. There also are risks that the de-extincted animal may carry horrible viruses or cause plagues (Text 4 Lines 24-25) The animal's virus could spread to humans and cause harm to their body. If an extinct species were to come back where would it live? (Text 3- Lines 17-20) Reintroducing an old species back into the environment would not be easy. The species may need a new food source and they may be predators to species that came after them. This could lead to the extinction of another species. If people also knew that animals were brought back, they may try to capture them. Article 2 Lines 31-32 ~~argues~~ argues that some extinct animals performed vital services in their ecosystems. But ~~the~~ ~~ecosystems~~ their ecosystems can provide and function without them. Their ecosystems have most likely adapted to the loss of their ~~ecosystem~~ services and no longer need them. Just like everything else in the world, when something is lost we learn to function without it.

Another big, controversial issue with de-extinction is the money part. De-extinction costs millions of dollars and is not guaranteed to work. If the organism can not be revived then there goes millions of dollars out the door. There are very few resources for ~~the~~ science and we should use these resources to prevent extinction instead of using them to de-extinct a few species (Text 4 lines 4-8). The money and resources used to de-extinct a few species could be used to raise awareness and stop the extinction of thousands of species. (Text 4 lines 5-8). The causes of extinction can be prevented, but not if the resources used to do this are being put into de-extinction.

De-extinction is becoming a very controversial topic. There are several arguments for and against the idea, but the ones against de-extinction are much stronger. Text 3 and Text 4 were useful in proving the idea that de-extinction is not a good idea.

Anchor Level 4-B

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Bringing already extinct species back to life is not a good idea*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Article 2 lines 31-32 argues that some extinct animals performed vital services in their ecosystems. But their ecosystems can provide and function with out them*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*De-Extinction poses many threats to the environment and to society. Organisms ... would not be able to adapt ... may carry horrible viruses; may need a new food source ... may be predators; De-extinction costs millions of dollars*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 4 Lines 24-25*) and (*Article 2 lines 31-32 argues*)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that states the claim, two paragraphs addressing the controversial issues related to de-extinction and incorporating a counterclaim (*de-extinction is not a good idea*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*The money and resources used to de-extinct a few species could be used to raise awareness and stop the extinction of thousands of species*). The essay demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors (*Text 3 The Case ... and Text 4 The Case ... idea, humans ... their body, source and, gaurenteed, revived ... then*) that do not hinder comprehension.

One might think de-extinction means bringing the dinosaurs back to life, but in reality de-extinction means reviving ~~these~~ species that have died within the past few tens of thousands of years and have left behind remains that harbor intact cells. Extinct species should be brought back into existence.

The positives weigh out the negatives for this proposition. Such positives may include that since humans were the main cause of many extinctions, bringing species back could act as a favor or an act to make up for the wrong of extinction. Also, another positive could be that the more species alive, the better balanced the ecosystem. "De-extinction could help increase the genetic diversity of small populations or those in captive breeding programs..." (Text 1, lines 28-29) The more diverse, the ~~but~~ more balanced and overall better the ecosystem is. Text 2 rebuts much with text 1. "Biological diversity is a storehouse of natural invention." (text 2, line 29) Both statements provide the message that de-extinction brings about more diversity and the

more diversity the better. Bringing back extinct species isn't all that de-extinction can do. "De-extinction advocates counter that the cloning and genome engineering technologies being developed for de-extinction could also help preserve endangered species, especially ones that don't breed easily in captivity." (text 2, lines 40-42) De-extinction can benefit both ~~extinct~~ extinct species and alive species. In return, this scientific advancement also gives the ecosystem a better sense of control.

Although there are much more positives associated with de-extinction, there are also some negatives. Many people that are against de-extinction state that everything happens for a reason and that species die because their environment and food supply also die. The problem with this point is that species aren't naturally dying, humans are killing species by hunting and other methods. Even though text 3 possess many negatives toward de-extinction, it does state that a ton of species are ~~asking~~ at the verge of extinction which gives scientists

even more of a reason to help save them. "De-extinction intends to resurrect single, charismatic species, yet millions of species are at risk of extinction" (text's lines 7-8)

De-extinction can only further benefit the world and ecosystem. This scientific innovation is based off of positive intentions and will produce positive effects. Extinct species should most definitely be brought back into existence. The more species the more diverse. The more diverse, the better the ecosystem.

Anchor Level 4-C

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Extinct species should be brought back into existence and De-extinction can only further benefit the world and ecosystem*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Many people that are against de-extinction state that everything happens for a reason and that species die because their environment and food supply also die. The problem with this point is that species aren't naturally dying, humans are killing species by hunting and other methods*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*another positive could be that the more species alive, the better balanced the ecosystem; Bringing back extinct species isn't all that de-extinction can do; De-extinction can benefit both extinct species and alive species*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(text 1, lines 28-29) and (text 2, line 29)], although a citation is lacking in the first paragraph. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay. The essay introduces the claim in the opening paragraph, provides two paragraphs supporting the claim with a brief reference to a counterclaim, and a conclusion reiterating the claim (*Extinct species should most definitely be brought back into existence*). The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*weigh out, much more positives, based off of*). The essay demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors (*propasition; benefit; dying, humans; text 3 possess; definetly*) that do not hinder comprehension.