

QUESTION 28 – SCORING RUBRIC – CRITICAL LENS

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

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

The world we live in is not merely divided into good or evil, black or white. Several actions of humans decidedly fall into the gray, murky <sup>area</sup> of human morality. Thus, Sir John Lubbock makes a valid statement when he says, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." This can be construed to mean that evil is not always immoral, and that the representations of evil may be misleading. This statement permeates most of human consciousness. The world of literature is a fine example of this, and two works that concretely support the above statement are Catch-22 by Joseph Heller and To Kill A Mockingbird by Harper Lee.

Catch-22 offers several vivid realizations of this truth. Yossarian, as a bomber in World War II, must keep flying missions while his superior officers continue to raise the number required. This puts him in a helpless position that requires him to risk his life daily. As his friends die in the planes around him, and by the end of the novel, no one remains except for the chaplain and Major Danby. After hearing news that his bunkmate, Orr, is alive in Sweden, Yossarian concludes that he must run away. In most cultures, escapist attitudes are frowned upon. Desertion from one's army is considered "evil." Yossarian, however, concludes that he can live if he runs away, which is good. The two contrasting moral dilemmas prove that Lubbock's statement is true, and that the "evil" of desertion does not imply that one is immoral, rather, that one is smart and "good" to shun fighting. Another conspicuous example is when the chaplain enters the hospital due to "Wisconsin shingles," a non-existent disease. The novel states that the chaplain had lied, and lying is a sin and

evil. However, it suggests, how could a sin possibly feel that good? Thus, the "evil" white lie was a victory for the chaplain's self-indulgence and, therefore, was "good" in disguise. It becomes impossible to test actions by morals when evil can be good. Hubbock's quote illustrates a truth of all men; that humans can sometimes disregard "morals" when they serve as a justification for evil, and when such disregard leads to true "goodness."

In To Kill A Mockingbird by Harper Lee, Scout and Jem are completely scared of the house of their next door neighbor, Boo Radley. The evil stories of the town gossip frighten them. The story of Boo stabbing his father with scissors is certainly evil and ingrained in the children's minds. With the entire town scared, the children develop a morbid fascination with Boo. Later in the novel, a court case that their father is a lawyer for spirals out of control and captivates the entire town. When the man Atticus (their father) had slighted in court tries to kill Jem and Scout on Halloween, an unexpected Boo Radley comes out of his house and saves the children. Thus, the misrepresentation of Boo as "evil" held no weight. Rather, he was simply a quiet, shy and righteous man. This proves that the representation of evil can mislead, and that good can be in disguise thereof. Therefore, Hubbock's quote is again validated when weighed in the world of To Kill A Mockingbird.

In history and in literature, the anti-hero is an important figure. Often troubled with moral decisions, he/she may take the easy and, what some may believe

to be, escapist way out, but, in retrospect, that may be a good decision. Morality plagues all, and Sir John Lubbock was a wise man when stating that "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." The interpretation seems to be that actions perceived as evil can be either misrepresented or justified to be good, making much of what the civilized world decides is evil really a just and correct decision. Through the lens of To Kill A Mockingbird by Harper Lee and Catch-22 by Joseph Heller, it is easy to connect the quote and interpretation to the world of literature and, subsequently, to the world around us.

Anchor Level 6 – A

Quality	Commentary
	<b>The response:</b>
<b>Meaning</b>	Provides an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statement and clearly establishes the criteria for analysis, stating that <i>this can be construed to mean that evil is not always immoral, and that the representations of evil may be misleading</i> . The response uses the criteria to make insightful analysis of <i>Catch-22</i> ( <i>The two contrasting moral dilemmas prove that Lubbock's statement is true, and that the "evil" of desertion does not imply that one is immoral</i> ) and of <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> ( <i>Thus, the misrepresentation of Boo as "evil" held no weight</i> ).
<b>Development</b>	Develops ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence from <i>Catch-22</i> ( <i>In most cultures, escapist attitudes are frowned upon ... Yossarian, however, concludes that he can live if he runs away, which is good</i> ) and from <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> [ <i>When the man Atticus (their father) had slighted in court tries to kill Jem and Scout on Halloween, an unexpected Boo Radley comes out of his house and saves the children</i> ]. The response incorporates the appropriate literary elements of conflict ( <i>moral dilemmas</i> ) and characterization ( <i>he was simply a quiet, shy and righteous man</i> ).
<b>Organization</b>	Maintains the focus established by the critical lens on how <i>actions perceived as evil can be either misrepresented or justified to be good</i> . The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, first interpreting the lens, then discussing the <i>vivid realizations of this truth</i> as experienced by Yossarian and how <i>the representation of evil</i> as applied to Boo Radley can mislead, and ending with a final clarification of the lens and how it applies <i>in history and in literature</i> . The response makes skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions ( <i>This puts him in; However, it suggests; Later in the novel</i> ).
<b>Language Use</b>	Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging ( <i>victory for the chaplain's self-indulgence and Morality plagues all</i> ), with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose ( <i>it is easy to connect the quote and interpretation to the world of literature and, subsequently, to the world around us</i> ). The response varies structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning ( <i>Several actions of humans decidedly fall into the gray, murky area of human morality</i> ).
<b>Conventions</b>	Demonstrates control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.
<b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6 in all qualities.	

I strongly agree with the statement that much of what we call evil is actually good in disguise. As humans, our instinct is to judge the actions of others and assess them, especially in the context of our own self interest. Thus, often, without knowledge of intentions or motives, people question actions of others as evil, when ~~the~~ those actions may have been backed by a benevolent force. Subjectivity often clouds our moral compass, bringing us to be overly critical of certain actions. Examples that corroborate this position ~~are~~ can be found in such literary classics as Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* and Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*.

*To Kill a Mockingbird* follows the story of the Finch family. The patriarch, Atticus, is a righteous and upstanding lawyer who strives to endow his son, Jem, and daughter, Scout, with strong moral values. When a black man, Tom Robinson, is accused of raping a white woman, Mayella Ewell, he faces a harsh sentence. Atticus, however, recognizes that the trial is rooted in racist hatred rather than hard evidence. As a result, he intervenes and defends Robinson in the trial, seeking to overturn the deeply embedded social norms in the Southern town. Instead, Atticus' peers are outraged and feel he is evil for standing up for a man who, in their eyes, is a rapist and of a lying, wrongdoing, inferior race. They see the institution of racism as a facade behind which they can mask their own personal flaws. The Ewells, for example, are

Impoverished, cheating, lying alcoholics. However, as long as racism dominates the town's collective consciousness, the Ewells will be superior in at least some way. Atticus' radical stance is seen as an offense, and townspeople mob Atticus and threaten him from a perspective unclouded by racist sentiment and personal interest. Atticus is clearly trying to do something positive. However, the townspeople judge his actions as evil guided by their own flawed subjectivity.

The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn ~~is~~ features a unique protagonist, Huck, who has no regard for societal constraints and ~~chooses~~ chooses to live life in a pragmatic way, guided by his own pleasure, logic, and personal fulfillment. Without a proper upbringing, Huck possesses almost a hedonistic view of life; he questions authority that dictate what's supposedly right and wrong and sees through what seems to him to be blind adherence to arbitrary social restrictions. A widow takes Huck in to her home, and provides him with food and shelter. She attempts to teach him appropriate behavior, and ~~teach~~ polite etiquette, and to reform his wandering, ~~is~~ often disconnected mindset. A strong believer in religion, the widow attempts to imbue Huck with faith and Christian morals, and with fear of hell and love of heaven. Huck sees the widow's actions as burdensome, restrictive, frustrating, and hypocritical. He cannot understand her values and instead finds her attempts to change him as useless and angrily stringent annoyances. However, from an objective point of view, the widow is clearly coming from

an unselfish and caring motivation. She is only trying to help and support, rather than scold and restrain Huck. In her eyes, religious devotion and strict etiquette are the keys to living a respectable life, and she wants to provide Huck with an opportunity to achieve her version of happiness and contentment. However, with his mentality skewed by personal desire and self-interest, Huck remains angered and ~~is~~ frustrated with the widow's actions.

Overall, actions that may in truth be guided by a will to help others or do good, humans' inherent subjectivity and self-interest can compel us to misjudge such actions as evil or angering in certain contexts. Though Athicus is innocently trying to help a man he believes was wrongly accused of rape, his peers adjudicate his motives as damaging and evil. Similarly, while the widow is trying to provide Huck with a better life, Huck sees her attempts as frustrating and misguided. While misunderstandings ~~are~~ can often be difficult to circumvent, we should try our best to avoid subjectivity and bias when assessing the actions of others and instead approach such matters with empathy and openmindedness.

**Anchor Level 6 – B**

<b>Quality</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Meaning</b>	<p><b>The response:</b> Provides an interpretation of the critical lens that is faithful to the complexity of the statement and clearly establishes the criteria for analysis (<i>Thus, often, without knowledge of intentions or motives, people question actions of others as evil, when those actions may have been backed by a benevolent force</i>). The response uses the criteria to make insightful analysis of <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> (<i>However, the townspeople judge his actions as evil guided by their own flawed subjectivity</i>) and of <i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> (<i>However, from an objective point of view, the widow is clearly coming from an unselfish and caring motivation</i>).</p>
<b>Development</b>	<p>Develops ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence from <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> (<i>Atticus, however, recognizes that the trial is rooted in racist hatred rather than hard evidence and The Ewells, for example, are impoverished, cheating, lying alcoholics</i>) and from <i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> (<i>A strong believer in religion, the widow attempts to imbue Huck with faith and christian morals, and with fear of hell and love of heaven and However, with his mentality skewed by personal desire and self interest, Huck remains angered and frustrated with the widow's actions</i>). The response incorporates appropriate literary elements, discussing <i>point of view</i> and its objective aspects in both texts.</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens on how <i>actions that may in truth be guided by a will to help others or do good</i> may be misconstrued as <i>evil or angering in certain contexts</i>. The response exhibits a logical and coherent structure, first interpreting the lens and motives that cause people <i>to be overly critical of certain actions</i>, then discussing the attempt by Atticus Finch <i>to overturn the deeply embedded social norms in the Southern town</i> and Huck's attempt to deal with <i>what seems to him is blind adherence to arbitrary social restrictions</i>, and concluding with a summary that emphasizes <i>humans' inherent subjectivity and self-interest</i> as reason for misjudging the actions of others. The response makes skillful use of appropriate devices and transitions (<i>Examples that corroborate, As a result, rather than</i>).</p>
<b>Language Use</b>	<p>Is stylistically sophisticated, using language that is precise and engaging (<i>clouds our moral compass, racism dominates the town's collective consciousness, almost a hedonistic view of life</i>), with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose. The response varies structure and length of sentences to enhance meaning (<i>They see the institution of racism as a façade behind which they can mask their own personal flaws</i>).</p>
<b>Conventions</b>	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>Scoutt, ubringing, ettiquette</i>) only when using sophisticated language.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 6, although it is somewhat weaker in conventions.</p>	



Sir John Lubbock once said, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." Sometimes the actions of a person may appear to be evil, but what is inside of the person and what reasons he had for his actions may change the opinion of him. This idea is greatly supported in the Gothic horror novel Frankenstein, by Mary Shelley, and the moralistic play The Crucible, written by Arthur Miller. In Frankenstein, an insane scientist brings the dead back to life, and the monster is mistaken for an evil being even though it wants only to be loved. In The Crucible, the main character, John Proctor, is thought to be evil for supposedly being a witch even though he is not one. Both of these works help to show that Sir John Lubbock's quote is true through the development of the characters and through themes.

In Mary Shelley's horrifying novel, Frankenstein, the protagonist Victor Frankenstein attempts to play God by bringing inanimate body parts back to life. He succeeds in creating a disgusting, eight-foot-tall monster with ugly yellow skin and long, flowing, black hair. Terrified of his creation, Victor flees from the creature, leaving it by itself. Typically, Frankenstein (the creature) is thought of as scary and hideous, but in this novel, the author sets up the reader to pity the monster because of its heart wrenching situation. The monster feels a lot of pain because it knows that if its own creator can not love it, it will be loved by no one. It ends up

being invited into a blind man's house. They eat and drink together while enjoying each other's company and holding polite conversation. When the blind man's family comes into the house, they attack the monster, forcing it to flee. When the creature was shown kindness by someone, it showed kindness in return. Frankenstein looked like an evil monster, but his characterization shows that the "monster" was really no evil being at all. It was just a kind-hearted and sad living being that yearned to love and be loved in return.

In a second work, Arthur Miller's play The Crucible, the galliant John Proctor is accused of witchcraft by his cowardly house servant, Mary Warren. Afraid of being condemned to death due to witchery, Mary turns the blame to John Proctor. The only way to spare his life would be to lie and confess that he saw the Devil and was, indeed, a witch. The theme throughout this play is how truth is sacrificed because of evil doings. After John is accused, he shouts, "I say God is dead!" This causes him to be evil in all of the town's eyes. But, in fact, he is not evil. He just does not want to lie to save his life. He sacrifices his life in order to keep his good name and the goodness in his heart.

Sir John Lubbock once stated "Much, however, at what we call evil is really good in disguise." This statement is sufficiently supported in the Gothic horror novel Frankenstein in which a monster, created by Victor

Frankenstein, is mistaken to be evil and vindictive even though it just wants love. The quote is also supported in Arthur Miller's play The Crucible through its theme and its protagonist John Proctor. Both of these works truly show that many people are mistaken for evil, but, on the contrary, are good inside.

Anchor Level 5 – A

Quality	Commentary
<b>Meaning</b>	<b>The response:</b> Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis ( <i>Sometimes the actions of a person may appear to be evil, but what is inside of the person and what reasons he had for his actions may change the opinion of him</i> ). The response uses the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of <i>Frankenstein</i> [ <i>Typically, Frankenstein (the creature) is thought of as scary and hideous, but in this novel, the author sets up the reader to pity the monster because of its heart wrenching situation</i> ] and <i>The Crucible</i> ( <i>But, in fact, he is not evil. He just does not want to lie to save his life</i> ).
<b>Development</b>	Develops ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence from <i>Frankenstein</i> ( <i>Victor Frankenstein attempts to play God by bringing inanimate body parts back to life. He succeeds in creating a disgusting, eight-foot-tall monster</i> ) and from <i>The Crucible</i> ( <i>John Proctor is accused of witchcraft by his cowardly house servant, Mary Warren. Afraid of being condemned to death due to witchery, Mary turns the blame to John Proctor</i> ). The response addresses characterization in <i>Frankenstein</i> ( <i>his characterization shows that the “monster” was really no evil being</i> ) and theme in <i>The Crucible</i> ( <i>The theme throughout this play is how truth is sacrificed because of evil doings</i> ).
<b>Organization</b>	Maintains the focus established by the critical lens on how many people are mistaken for evil, but, on the contrary, are good inside. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first interpreting and agreeing with the critical lens, then for each work, focusing on a main character ( <i>Frankenstein</i> and <i>John Proctor</i> ) and the dilemma each faces when his actions are mistakenly viewed as evil, and concluding with a reaffirmation of the validity of Lubbock’s statement. Appropriate transitions are used ( <i>Both of these works, In a second work, After John is accused</i> ).
<b>Language Use</b>	Uses language that is fluent and original, with evident awareness of audience and purpose ( <i>This statement is sufficiently supported in the Gothic horror novel Frankenstein</i> ). The response varies structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing ( <i>When the creature was shown kindness by someone, it showed kindness in return</i> ).
<b>Conventions</b>	Demonstrates control of the conventions with essentially no errors beyond a misspelling ( <i>galliant</i> ), even with sophisticated language.
<b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.	

Sir John Lubbock once stated: "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." In other words, the evils in society, corruption, jealousy, selfishness, etc. ~~usually~~ ~~bring the inherent passions of the perpetrators~~ awaken, and sometimes unite, ~~under the common~~ people against certain causes, allowing the <sup>members of society</sup> ~~general population~~ to work ~~together~~ to advocate for <sup>either personal or</sup> social change. Though evils cripple individuals in a society, ultimately, ~~an~~ ~~united~~ people's outrage (that frequently results from exposure to these evils) and resulting actions can far outweigh the evil originally unleashed onto society.

Romeo and Juliet, by William Shakespeare, is well-known for the unfounded hate between the Montagues and Capulets, as well as for the misery that ensues for both Romeo and Juliet. Hostility between the two families results in a number of murders, as well as the suicides of both Romeo and Juliet. However, ~~although~~ despite the number of generations in which this prejudice existed, evil must culminate at some point: people will no longer tolerate it at a certain point. Tensions between the Montagues and Capulets, <sup>illustrated by an increasingly desperate tone + Romeo + Juliet's feelings of being trapped,</sup> had risen to such a point that their young

people were dead: ~~the~~ results of decades of hostile attitudes. Upon this realization, Shakespeare uses stunning imagery, selective diction, and a mournful, despairing tone to indicate the profound anguish experienced by both families. The symbolism utilized by Shakespeare, that Romeo + Juliet act as sacrifices to their families' unrelenting hate, completely changes Verona. The climax, or culmination of evil ~~paradoxes~~ <sup>shocks</sup> both families, allowing them to realize the extent of their actions and to make a lasting peace between the two. ~~Admirable~~. Despite the tragedy apparent throughout Romeo and Juliet, the sheer intensity of evil, in the form of hate and prejudice, gives way to renewed reconciliation and a renouncement of former wrongs.

Cal Trask, one of the main characters in John Steinbeck's East of Eden, first appears to be an antagonist: he is characterized as ~~a~~ manipulative, even as a small boy, and self-centered. The stark juxtaposition between Cal and his brother Aron, characterized as angelic and "golden," seems to highlight Cal's inherent evil nature. In spite of this, as Cal's character develops, Steinbeck reveals that beneath Cal's facade of

cruelty, he holds a compelling desire to be "good." He reflects on his motives and actions constantly; eventually, his will to help those around him overrides his instinct to think only of himself. Aron, on the other hand, becomes self-righteous and arrogant. Thus, Aron's misgivings awaken his conscience to his apparent flaws, allowing him to reform and to create a <sup>strong</sup> character of which he could be proud of. What had originally appeared as evil gave way to reflection, determination, and ultimately, reform.

Evil is apparent in any society. Although its negative effects should not be underestimated, many times, its severity awakens people to understand their shortcomings, allowing them to correct prejudiced attitudes or to forgo hateful actions. Ultimately, this reform is long-lasting, many times outweighing the evil that ~~existed~~ <sup>existed</sup> in the first place.

**Anchor Level 5 – B**

<b>Quality</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Meaning</b>	<p><b>The response:</b></p> <p>Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis, stating that <i>the evils in society ... awaken, and sometimes unite, people against certain causes, allowing the members of society to work to advocate for either personal or social change.</i> The response uses the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>Despite the tragedy apparent throughout <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>, the sheer intensity of evil, in the form of hate and prejudice, gives way to renewed reconciliation and a renouncement of former wrongs</i>) and <i>East of Eden</i> (<i>Aron's misgivings awaken his conscience to his apparent flaws, allowing him to reform and to create a strong character</i>).</p>
<b>Development</b>	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence from <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>Hostility between the two families results in a number of murders, as well as the suicides of both Romeo and Juliet and The climax, or culmination of evil shocks both families, allowing them ... to make a lasting peace</i>) and <i>East of Eden</i> (<i>eventually, his will to help those around him overrides his instinct to think only of himself</i>). The response uses tone and symbolism in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>Tensions ... illustrated by an increasingly desperate tone + Romeo + Juliet's feelings of being trapped and The symbolism ... that Romeo + Juliet act as sacrifices to their families' unrelenting hate</i>) and characterization in <i>East of Eden</i> (<i>he is characterized as manipulative, even as a small boy, and self-centered and Aron, characterized as angelic and "golden," seems to highlight Cal's inherent evil nature</i>).</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens that evil's severity awakens people to understand their forthcoming, allowing them to correct prejudiced attitudes or to forgo hateful actions. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, beginning with an interpretation of an agreement with the lens, then presenting information from both works to support instances of reform arising from the evil that existed in the first place. The response uses appropriate devices and transitions (<i>Though evils cripple individuals in a society; In spite of this; Aron, on the other hand, becomes</i>).</p>
<b>Language Use</b>	<p>Uses language that is fluent and original (<i>decades of hostile attitudes and stunning imagery, selective diction, and a mournful, despairing tone to indicate the profound anguish</i>, that is sometimes inappropriate (+ for "and"), with evident awareness of audience and purpose. The response varies structure and length of sentences to control rhythm and pacing (<i>Evil is apparent in any society</i>).</p>
<b>Conventions</b>	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation (<i>point: people and climax, or culmination of evil shocks</i>) and capitalization (<i>verona and proud of. what</i>) only when using sophisticated language.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5 in all qualities.</p>	

Sir John Lubbock once said "Much however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." There are times ~~when~~<sup>when</sup> people have good intentions but they do not execute their ideas properly, leading others to call them evil. However those are rare cases. Peoples whose actions ~~are~~<sup>that are perceived as</sup> evil by others usually have a malicious intention for personal gain. This can be seen through the actions of Brutus and Macbeth in <sup>William Shakespeare's</sup> Julius Caesar and Macbeth respectively. Through internal and external conflict Brutus and Macbeth are seen as evil after committing ~~a crime~~ a crime for their own benefit.

In the play Macbeth, Macbeth receives a prophecy by the three witches who inform him that he will become king. Macbeth is ~~at~~ aware that the only way he can become king is if he murders the current king. Macbeth is distraught; does he ~~ignore~~ ignore his ambitious feelings stirring inside of him? Or does he allow his ambition to take over and kill the king? The king is someone who is considered honorable in the eyes of the people living in Scotland. Macbeth resolves his internal conflict by murdering the king. Macbeth's desire for power, royalty, and wealth leads him to kill the man that he ought to protect. There was no good in Macbeth's action. His action did not benefit anyone except himself. Macbeth's action may have brought a short period of happiness to his life while it brought a long period of ~~and~~<sup>sadness</sup> to the people around him.



Similarly to Macbeth, Brutus is willing to do anything for his own benefit. ~~Brutus~~ In the play, Brutus believes Julius Caesar is a threat to ~~the~~ the town. He believes Julius Caesar is ambitious and wants to become king. Brutus is persuaded by his friends to assassinate Julius. After killing Julius Caesar, it is apparent that Brutus is truly the ambitious one. Killing Julius Caesar brings corruption to the town. Brutus' ambition leads him to his defeat at the end of the play. If Brutus ~~had~~ had good intentions he would not have to suffer the negative consequences of his actions. Julius Caesar believed Brutus was one of his true friends but Brutus' actions showed that he was a bad friend in disguise.

Sometimes ~~peop~~ a person's actions can appear to be evil on the surface, but in reality the actions are good<sup>and are intended to benefit the common good.</sup>. Other times both a person's actions and intentions are evil. Brutus' and Macbeth's actions in Julius Caesar and Macbeth are evil in both intention and execution. Brutus\* and Macbeth let their ambition <sup>get the best of</sup> ~~take over~~ them <sup>leading them to</sup> ~~and~~ kill the men who considered them <sup>to be</sup> their friends. Brutus and Macbeth committed murders for their own personal gain while making the people around them suffer. Brutus and Macbeth are not good in disguise like Sir John Lubbock refers to in ~~his~~ his quote. Instead Brutus and Macbeth are people who men<sup>originally</sup> call good but are evil in disguise.

## Anchor Level 5 – C

Quality	Commentary
<b>Meaning</b>	<p><b>The response:</b></p> <p>Provides a thoughtful interpretation of the critical lens by disagreeing with the idea of <i>what we call evil is really good in disguise</i> that clearly establishes the criteria for analysis (<i>peoples whose actions that are precieved as evil by others usually have a malicious intention for personal gain</i>). The response uses the criteria to make a clear and reasoned analysis of <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>There was no good in Macbeth's action. His action did not benefit anyone except himself</i>) and <i>Julius Caesar</i> (<i>Brutus was one of his true friends but Brutus' actions showed that he was a bad friend in disguise</i>).</p>
<b>Development</b>	<p>Develops ideas clearly and consistently, with reference to relevant and specific evidence from both <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>Macbeth's desire for power, royalty, and wealth leads him to kill the man that he ought to protect</i>) and <i>Julius Caesar</i> (<i>After killing Julius caesar, it is apparent that Brutus is truly the ambitious one</i>). The response integrates the literary elements of <i>internal and external conflict</i> (<i>Macbeth is distraught; does he ignore his ambitious feelings ... or does he allow his ambition to take over and Brutus is persuaded by his friends to assassinate Julius</i>) into the discussion of both texts.</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens on the idea that <i>people who men orginally call good but are evil in disguise</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first interpreting and disagreeing with the lens, then explaining how both <i>Brutus' and Macbeth's actions in Julius caesar and Macbeth are evil in both intention and execution</i>, and concluding with a summation that reinforces the established focus. Transitions are appropriately used (<i>Similarly to, If Brutus had, Other times</i>).</p>
<b>Language Use</b>	<p>Uses appropriate language (<i>Macbeth is aware that the only way he can become king is if he murders the current king</i>), with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>This can be seen through the actions of Brutus and Macbeth</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length (<i>In the play, Brutus believes Julius Caesar is a threat to the town</i>).</p>
<b>Conventions</b>	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>commiting, recieves, Scotland</i>), punctuation (<i>intentions but, Instead Brutus, good but</i>), and usage (<i>whose actions that are and a prophecy by</i>) that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5, although it is somewhat weaker in language use and conventions.</p>	

Sir John Lubbock once said, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." This statement ultimately means that often times, people may do the wrong thing for the greater good. To the reader, characters who do things like this can be seen as confusing and complex, but this a unique character trait that the author uses to make the character more interesting. The idea of "evil being good in disguise" can be seen true in both Romeo and Juliet by Shakespear and The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn by Mark Twain.

In Romeo and Juliet, two "star-crossed" lovers meet and fall in love, but because of the feud between their families, they are not allowed to be together. Because both Romeo and Juliet are stricken with young love, they find unique ways to communicate. Juliet uses her maid, Nurse, to communicate with Romeo, whereas Romeo is able to sneak into Juliet's house to meet her. Due to the fact that their lines of communication are often ~~broken~~<sup>broken</sup>, both Romeo and Juliet are often left with confusing messages, that ultimately led to their deaths. At one point in the play, Juliet is being forced to marry another man because her family does not know that she is already married to Romeo. As a result of this, Juliet takes medicine that will make appear as though she is dead so that when she wakes up, she can be with Romeo. Because the lines of communication between Romeo and Juliet aren't very stable, Romeo does not know that Juliet isn't really dead when he sees her ~~laying~~ laying in a coffin. Romeo loves Juliet so much that he kills himself to be with her. When Juliet awakens, she sees that Romeo has killed himself, and she proceeds to do the same. The act of killing someone, especially yourself is an evil action. Although what Romeo and Juliet did was wrong,

their actions can be justified or seen as good because they killed themselves just so that they could be together.

In *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* by Mark Twain, Huck Finn escapes the norms of society and his abusive father to travel along the Mississippi River. On his journey, Huck meets a runaway slave named Jim. Huck and Jim begin traveling together, but an inner conflict begins to develop within Huck because he understands that Jim is a nice person, but he is also someone's property that needs to be returned. As the novel progresses, Huck comes to like Jim more and more, but one day while they were traveling, Huck decided to play a trick on Jim. Because a massive storm had separated them, Huck thought it would be funny to take advantage of Jim and tell him that their separation had been a dream. Jim knew that Huck was taking advantage of him and started to get mad at Huck, but Huck couldn't understand why. It was ultimately uncovered that Jim really cared for Huck and wanted to protect him like he was his own son. Although Huck's actions were evil, they were influential in bringing Huck and Jim closer together.

In both *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, it can be seen that all evil actions are not inherently bad. Often times killing ~~oneself~~ yourself or tricking another person can ~~some~~ have positive outcomes, even if the initial action was evil.

**Anchor Level 4 – A**

Quality	Commentary
<b>Meaning</b>	<p><b>The response:</b> Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens that establishes the criteria for analysis, stating <i>that often times, people may do the wrong thing for the greater good</i>. The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>Although what Romeo and Juliet did was wrong, their actions can be justified or seen as good because they killed themselves just so that they could be together</i>) and <i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> (<i>Although Huck’s actions were evil, they were influential in bringing Huck and Jim closer together</i>).</p>
<b>Development</b>	<p>Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response uses specific and relevant evidence from <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>Juliet takes medicine that will make appear as though she is dead so ... she can be with Romeo</i>) and from <i>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> (<i>an inner conflict begins to develop within Huck because he understands that Jim is a nice person, but he is also someone’s property</i>). The discussion of the greater good is hinted at, but not developed.</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p>Maintains the focus established by the critical lens <i>that all evil actions are not inherently bad</i>. The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first interpreting the critical lens, then explaining how the potentially evil actions of Romeo and Juliet and of Huck are ultimately positive, and concluding with a reinterpretation of the lens. Appropriate devices and transitions are used (<i>whereas, As a result of this, As the novel progresses</i>).</p>
<b>Language Use</b>	<p>Uses appropriate language (<i>they are not allowed to be together and a massive storm had separated them</i>), with some awareness of audience and purpose (<i>To the reader, characters who do things like this can be seen as confusing and complex</i>). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure or length (<i>In The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn by Mark Twain, Huck Finn escapes the norms of society and his abusive father to travel along the Mississippi River</i>).</p>
<b>Conventions</b>	<p>Demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>often times</i>), punctuation (<i>messages, that and killing someone, especially yourself is</i>), and grammar (<i>strucken and laying</i>) only when using sophisticated language.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.</p>	

Sir John Lubbock once said, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." In other words, one may seem wicked on the outside but <sup>has</sup> ~~has~~ good <sup>intentions</sup> ~~intentions~~ on the inside. This lens is proven to be valid in the novel, *Of Mice and Men*, by John Steinbeck and in the play, "Othello", by William Shakespeare. Both authors use the literary elements of conflict and characterization to prove this lens to be true.

In Steinbeck's novel, *Of Mice and Men*, the character George Milton proves this quote valid. At the end of the novel, Curley found his wife dead and knew that Lennie Small killed her. Him and a mob were looking for Lennie to torture him and kill him slowly and painfully. George Milton took Lennie to a nearby pond and talked about their dream to own a farm to make him happy. After, George shot Lennie on the back of his head and Lennie died. This act may have seemed evil and wicked but, George only did it because he knew that if Curley found Lennie, he would've had a very painful death. George did it so Lennie would not be in

mystery if Curley would've killed him. George is a very caring person. He took care of Lennie for a while and did many things to help Lennie. He had good intentions to kill Lennie even though, it seemed evil.

In Shakespeare's play, "Othello," the character Othello proves this lens valid. Iago did many things to make Othello believe that ~~that~~ his wife, Desdemona, was unfaithful to him. For example, Iago took the handkerchief that Othello gave to Desdemona and put it in Cassio's room. To make Othello think that Desdemona gave it to him. Othello confronted Desdemona and he didn't believe anything she said. So, he killed her but, found out that she was innocent after. He was heartbroken and killed himself. Even though, he did something wicked, he didn't have any bad intentions to do it. He was just very sad but, after he knew he did something wrong. So, he punished himself. Othello is a very loyal and faithful person. He killed his wife because he thought she was unfaithful. But, he killed himself

after so that they can still be together. Clearly, Othello killed his wife but he didn't mean it and had good intentions.

One may seem wicked on the outside but, has good intentions on the inside was proven to be true in Steinbeck's novel and Shakespeare's play. Both George Milton and Othello did something bad and evil but, didn't mean it to be harmful and thought ~~was~~ what was best for the other person.

Anchor Level 4 – B

Quality	Commentary
<b>Meaning</b>	Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens that establishes the criteria for analysis, stating that <i>one may seem wicked on the outside but, has good intentions on the inside</i> . The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>Of Mice and Men</i> ( <i>George did it so Lennie would not be in misery if Curley would've killed him</i> ) and <i>Othello</i> ( <i>Othello is a very loyal and faithful person. He killed his wife because he thought she was unfaithful</i> ).
<b>Development</b>	Develops some ideas more fully than others. The response uses specific and relevant evidence from <i>Of Mice and Men</i> ( <i>George only did it because he knew that if Curley found Lennie, he would've had a very painful death</i> ) and <i>Othello</i> ( <i>Othello confronted Desdemona and he didn't believe anything she said. So, he killed her</i> ). While the response references the use of the literary elements of conflict and characterization, with the latter being hinted at ( <i>George is a very caring person and Othello is a very loyal and faithful person</i> ), neither is directly addressed.
<b>Organization</b>	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on how <i>one may seem wicked on the outside but, has good intentions on the inside</i> . The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first interpreting the lens, then presenting information regarding the good intentions behind the seemingly evil actions of both George and Othello to validate the lens, and concluding with a brief summation. Internal consistency is weakened by the lack of explanation of how the evil acts were perceived and how this created a conflict within each character.
<b>Language Use</b>	Uses appropriate language ( <i>He had good intentions to kill Lennie even though, it seemed evil and Othello killed his wife but, he didn't mean it</i> ), with some awareness of audience and purpose ( <i>This lens is proven to be valid</i> ). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure and length ( <i>Iago did many things to make Othello believe that his wife, Desdemona, was unfaithful</i> ).
<b>Conventions</b>	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling ( <i>intensions and hankerchief</i> ), punctuation ( <i>"Othello," ; but, found; sad but, after</i> ), grammar ( <i>one may ... has and Him and a mob</i> ), and usage ( <i>shot Lennie on the back</i> ) that do not hinder comprehension.
<b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.	



Sir John Lubbock once said, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." Lubbock means that ~~every~~ every evil person starts off good. The good intentions of one may end up leading them to do something bad. If someone is evil, they had probably started off as a good person. In the novel The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald and All Quiet on the Western Front by Erich Remarque, good people ended up doing evil things.

In the novel The Great Gatsby, by F. Scott Fitzgerald, Jay Gatz started off his hunt for love with completely good intentions. He wanted to be with his old lover, Daisy, but she was married, living a luxurious life filled with riches. Gatz got himself into illegal dealings to become part of high class society to win back her love. Many people would see this as evil, but a good man just took a bad path on his journey of life.

In the novel All Quiet on the Western Front, by Erich Remarque, the soldiers were seen as evil. Many people saw war as a negative thing, ultimately believing the soldiers were evil killing machines.

The soldiers were originally good kids, getting an education and enjoying life. Society encouraged them to fight in the war, ultimately causing them to become "evil."

In the novels *All Quiet on the Western Front*, and *The Great Gatsby*, characters are portrayed as good but are inevitably corrupted. All evil once started off good, it just happened to be corrupted somewhere down the road. All good is exposed to evil, and at any second any given good can turn bad. ~~stayed~~

Anchor Level 4 – C

Quality	Commentary
<b>Meaning</b>	<b>The response:</b> Provides a reasonable interpretation of the critical lens that establishes the criteria for analysis, stating that <i>every evil person starts off good</i> and noting that <i>the good intentions of one may end up leading them to do something bad</i> . The response makes implicit connections between the criteria and <i>The Great Gatsby</i> ( <i>a good man just took a bad path on his journey of life</i> ) and <i>All Quiet on the Western Front</i> ( <i>Society encouraged them to fight in the war, ultimately causing them to become "evil."</i> )
<b>Development</b>	Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from <i>The Great Gatsby</i> ( <i>He wanted to be with his old lover, Daisy, but she was married, living a luxurious life filled with riches</i> ) and <i>All Quiet on the Western Front</i> ( <i>The soldiers were originally good kids, getting an education and enjoying life</i> ). The response does not address literary elements.
<b>Organization</b>	Maintains a clear and appropriate focus on <i>characters who are portrayed as good but are inevitably corrupted</i> . The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first stating and interpreting the lens, then moving to a brief discussion of <i>Jay Gatz's</i> pursuit of Daisy and the attitude toward soldiers in war, and ending with a summary conclusion. The repetition in the conclusion detracts from internal consistency.
<b>Language Use</b>	Uses appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose ( <i>All good is exposed to evil, and at any second any given good can turn bad</i> ). The response occasionally makes effective use of sentence structure and length ( <i>Gatz got himself into illegal dealings to become part of high class society to win back her love</i> ).
<b>Conventions</b>	Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation ( <i>by, F Scott; Front, and; good, it</i> ) and agreement ( <i>one ... them and someone ... they</i> ) that do not hinder comprehension.
<b>Conclusion:</b> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4, although it is somewhat weaker in development.	