FOR TEACHERS ONLY

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

ELA

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Wednesday, June 14, 2023 — 9:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., only

RATING GUIDE

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

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

Mechanics of Rating

Scoring the Multiple-Choice Questions

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

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

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 in pairs of high and 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 contain score and commentary.)

(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
Part 2 Rubric
Writing From Sources: Argument

Criteria	6 Essays at this Level:	5 Essays at this Level:	4 Essays at this Level:	3 Essays at this Level:	2 Essays at this Level:	1 Essays at this Level:
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	-introduce a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a precise claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a reasonable claim, as directed by the task -demonstrate some analysis of the texts, but insufficiently distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-introduce a claim -demonstrate confused or unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims	-do not introduce a claim -do not demonstrate analysis of the texts
Command of Evidence: the extent to which the essay presents evidence from the provided texts to support analysis	-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	-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	-present ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis -demonstrate inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present ideas inconsistently and/or inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant -demonstrate little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material	-present little or no evidence from the texts -do not make use of citations
Coherence, Organization, and Style: the extent to which the essay logically organizes complex ideas, concepts, and information using formal style and precise language	-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	-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	-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	-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	-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	-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	-demonstrate control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language	-demonstrate control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language	-demonstrate partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension	-demonstrate emerging control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that hinder comprehension	-demonstrate a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult	-are minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable

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

The modern world faces new struggles every day. These struggles are often generated by recent technology and industry. Such is the case for climate change (global warming). Global temperatures have been rising due to the increased emission of greenhouse gases by factories and vehicles. One proposed solution to combat this temperature increase, which is causing sea levels to rise and weather to become more destructive, is solar geoengineering. This proposal has been met with various opinions. However, it is clear that solar geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming despite its potential for sharp temperature changes in the event this process should come to an abrupt end due to unforeseen circumstances. This is because this technology is relatively inexpensive and can allow experts to stabilize and better control climate outcomes at a time when such action is so urgently needed.

Solar geoengineering should be used to combat global warming because it is relatively inexpensive. Implementing solar geoengineering methods would be less expensive than current clean energy development. According to Harvard University physicist David Keith, "This scheme would cost about $700 million annually – less than 1 percent of what is currently spent on clean energy development" (Text 2, lines 14-15). Not only would the use of solar geoengineering techniques reduce global warming, but they would also require less capital to be maintained. This would allow for more money to be spent on other pressing issues as well.

The use of solar engineering would be an effective mechanism for reducing global warming as it would allow for the stabilization and designing of climate outcomes. In Text 3, lines 32 and 33, Nguyen expresses that by using sulfate aerosol techniques, scientists are allowed not only to predict climate change, but to design it as well. This would be revolutionary technology if implemented because it could allow experts to regulate the climate to decrease the temperature rather than allowing it to increase as is presently the case due to greenhouse gas emissions. With this solar geoengineering method, scientists could better stabilize the effects of global warming.

A major argument against solar geoengineering is that if this process is abruptly ended, then there is the potential ~~to~~ that sharp climate changes would soon follow. As mentioned in Text 1, line 47, "Sharp temperature change could be 'catastrophic' for wildlife." These sharp changes have been theorized to occur with the sudden stop of aerosol release. However, other research studies have argued that this "sharp change" theory has been overdramatized (Text 1, lines 48-49). This means that the effects of stopping aerosol release are likely not going to bring about such drastic "catastrophic" changes as are theorized by certain researchers. It has further been suggested that "measures could be put in place to ensure that the risk is minimised" (Text 1, line 49).

As explained, solar geoengineering should be:

implemented as a way to reduce global warming since it is inexpensive and beneficial to determining and controlling climate outcomes. Although concerns have been raised regarding sharp temperature changes, the effects of these changes have likely been overestimated. As global society moves forward, it will be important to continue exploring solutions to preserving the planet, and solar geoengineering provides an excellent option for doing so.

Anchor Level 6–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*However, it is clear that solar geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming … because this technology is relatively inexpensive and can allow experts to stabilize and better control climate outcomes at a time when such action is so urgently needed*)
- The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Not only would the use of solar geoengineering techniques reduce global warming, but they would also require less capital to be maintained. This would allow for more money to be spent on other pressing issues …* and *This would be revolutionary technology if implemented because it could allow experts to regulate the climate to decrease the temperature rather than allowing it to increase as is presently the case due to greenhouse gas emissions*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*A major argument against solar geoengineering is that if this process is abruptly ended, then there is the potential that sharp climate changes would soon follow*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*"This scheme would cost about $700 million annually – less than 1 percent of what is currently spent on clean energy development"* and *It has further been suggested that "measures could be put in place to ensure that the risk is minimised"*).
- The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*As mentioned in Text 1, line 47* and (*Text 1, line 49*)].

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, first introducing the issue and providing a pro claim while acknowledging an opposing view. The introductory paragraph is followed by two paragraphs that support the claim. A third body paragraph addresses a *major argument against solar geoengineering* and a summative conclusion reaffirms the reasons that *solar geoengineering should be implemented as a way to reduce global warming*.
- The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*One proposed solution to combat this temperature increase, which is causing sea levels to rise and weather to become more destructive, is solar geoengineering* and *These sharp changes have been theorized to occur with the sudden stop of aerosol release*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

Global warming has been affecting our planet for several years now, causing scientists to scramble for a solution to stop it. When geoengineering was discovered and tested on a model scale, scientists believed they had found that solution. However, recent developments and research has found that although geoengineering would indeed decrease global warming, there were several consequences in using it. This all begged the question, should geoengineering be used to reduce global warming?

Scientists have already agreed that the key to tackling global warming is to minimize global greenhouse emissions. However, due to global emissions continuing to be on the rise, researchers have called for other measures that could be used in addition to emission cuts, and that is solar geoengineering. Solar geoengineering is defined as "a group of hypothetical technologies that could, in theory, counteract temperature rise by deflecting more sunlight away from the Earth's surface" (Text 1, lines 5-7). While it has already been determined that the use of geoengineering would indeed be effective and would have a strong cooling effect, lowering global warming, these technologies "do not aim to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and, therefore, would not be able to directly address problems such as ocean acidification" (Text 1, lines 15-16).

Indeed, while geoengineering could potentially lower global warming, it does not directly attack the cause, simply the symptoms, and the negative consequences

to that are immense. One such consequence would be "thousands of air pollution deaths a year" (Text 2, lines 35) due to the ~~[illegible]~~ million tons of sulfur in the stratosphere. Also, because geoengineering fails to affect the amount of carbon dioxide in the air, ocean acidification would continue unabated, according to text 2. Other side effects include a drier planet, with a "1 percent reduction in rainfall for every degree Celsius of warming counteracted" (text 2, lines 45-46), and an increase of skin cancers and ultraviolet damage to plant life due to the sulfates, which "alter atmospheric chemistry toward formation of ozone-destroying chlorine compounds" (text 2, lines 37-38).

Another dangerous side effect would come when the treatment would be stopped. According to (Text 3), (lines 52-53), "global temperatures would rocket back to previous levels so quickly that many species might struggle to survive". Because of all of the negative consequences, it is clear that using geoengineering is simply too risky to the planet, ~~[illegible]~~ and it seems that scientists agree. Ecologists issued a directive on geoengineering, and it was that there is to be a pause on "any large-scale climate intervention activities, including solar geoengineering or carbon capture until there is enough scientific evidence to justify such strategies" (text 3, lines 57-58).

The world has entered an era in which global warming and climate change is a very serious

threat. Fortunately, there are scientists who are working on finding a solution. And while they believe we as a society must work to save the planet as well, at this point it is clear that it wouldn't be enough. With the discovery of geoengineering came hope that we might just have a solution to help us. However, upon further research and development, it was found that applying geoengineering would lead to far too many negative impacts to the planet. While some scientists believe geo-engineering is still a viable option, it is clear that they are incorrect, and luckily, scientists made the right call on placing a moratorium on any more development concerning the dangerous activity until further notice. Perhaps with time, another safer option will be discovered, and we can finally attempt to save the planet before it's too late.

Anchor Level 6–B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*Indeed, while geoengineering could potentially lower global warming, it does not directly attack the cause, simply the symptoms, and the negative consequences to that are immense*).
- The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Other side effects include a drier planet … and an increase of skin cancers and ultraviolet damage to plant life due to the sulfates …* and *Because of all of the negative consequences, it is clear that using geoengineering is simply too risky to the planet, and it seems that scientists agree*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*While it has already been determined that the use of geoengineering would indeed be effective … these technologies "do not aim to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere…"*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis ("*global temperatures would rocket back to previous levels so quickly that many species might struggle to survive"* and *there is to be a pause on "any large-scale climate intervention activities, including solar geoengineering or carbon capture until there is enough scientific evidence to justify such strategies"*).
- The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 1, lines 5–7*) and (*text 2, lines 45–46*)] although one citation is missing line numbers.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces the topic, a second paragraph that defines solar geoengineering and presents both sides of the issue, setting up for the con claim and supporting arguments that are discussed in the two paragraphs that follow (*because geoengineering fails to affect the amount of carbon dioxide in the air, ocean acidification would continue unabated*), and concludes with a paragraph that summarizes the arguments and reaffirms the claim (*luckily, scientists made the right call on placing a moratorium on any more development concerning the dangerous activity until further notice*).
- The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*Global warming has been affecting our planet for several years now, causing scientists to scramble for a solution…*, *This all begged the question, should geoengineering be used to reduce global warming?*, and *With the discovery of geoengineering came hope that we might just have a solution to help us*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

Every day, the threat of climate change grows ever greater. Though there have been significant strides in preventing climate change, they have not been enough. It is projected that Earth's temperature will continue to rise throughout the century, causing catastrophic effects. However, there is a temporary solution: geoengineering. Though solar geoengineering isn't perfect, coupled with emission cuts, solar geoengineering has great potential to stop climate change.

It has been noted that the effects of solar geoengineering could be similar to that of a large-scale volcanic eruption. During an eruption, sulfur-dioxide is released into the atmosphere, blocking sunlight. This can subsequently cool the temperature of Earth by multiple degrees Celcius. Solar geoengineering employs the same idea. A fleet of planes could release aerosols into the atmosphere and they could "cool the planet in a similar way to a large volcanic eruption" (Text 1, lines 28-29). Not only would this solution be ~~cheap but~~ effective, but it would also be relatively cheap. It has been estimated that the cost of this plan would be roughly $700 million, which is "less than 1 percent of what is currently spent on clean energy development" (Text 2, line 15). Considering how inexpensive this solution could be, it must not be

disregarded.

Additionally, the amount of time it would take for the cooling effects of aerosols to take place is very short. If, in 2020, a large scale effort of releasing aerosols into the upper atmosphere began, temperatures could be stabalized. If this process continues, then global temperatures "could be stabalized at that year's level for the remainder of the century" (text 3, lines 35-36). The potential for solar geoengineering to save money is truly great. Even though a fully implemented geoengineering scheme would cost a few billion dollars a year, it has the potential to save the world a tremendous amount of money. The adverse effects of climate change could cost the world trillions of dollars. With geoengineering, those costs could be eliminated (text 4, lines 10-15).

A popular argument against solar geoengineering is the idea that it would allow the world to continue to emit greenhouse gases. Frank Keutsh states that implementing geoengineering would allow humanity to "merely stave off its symptoms" (text 3, line 11) instead of dealing with the source of the problem. However, social scientists have found the opposite to be true. As it turns out, "information about solar engineering increases willingness to pay for emission mitigation" (text 4, lines 49-50). Therefore, solar geoengineering would actually lead

to an increase in fixing carbon emissions.
Though solar geoengineering is far from perfect, it has the potential to mitigate the effects of climate change temporarily. Implementing this would give humanity the necessary time it needs to cut down on carbon emissions.

Anchor Level 5–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Though solar geoengineering isnt perfect, coupled with emission cuts, solar geoengineering has great potential to stop climate change*).
- The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Even though a fully implemented geoengineering scheme would cost a few billion dollars a year, it has the potential to save the world a tremendous amount of money* and *Therefore, solor geoengineering would actually lead to an increase in reducing carbon emissions*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*A popular argument against solor geoengineering is the idea that it would allow the world to continue to emit greenhouse gases*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*the cost of this plan … is "less than 1 percent of what is currently spent on clean energy development"* and *temperatures "could be stabalized at that year's level for the remainder of the century"*).
- 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 15*)].

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, first introducing the issue and a claim in support of solar geoengineering, followed by two body paragraphs of support (*A fleet of planes could release aerosols into the atmosphere and they could "cool the planet in a similar way to a large volcanic eruption* and *The potential for solor geoengineering to save money is truly great*) and a third body paragraph that presents and refutes the counterclaim (*Keutsh states that emplementing geoengineering would allow humanity to "merely stave off its symptoms"… However, social scientists have found the opposite to be true*), concluding with a reaffirmation of the claim (*Implementing this would give humanity the necessary time it needs to cut down on carbon emissions*).
- The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*This can subsequently cool the temperature of Earth by multiple degrees celcius*, *The adverse effects of climate change could cost the world trillions of dollars*, and *Though solor geoengineering is far from perfect, it has the potential to mitigate the effects of climate change*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*catostrophic, isnt, celcius*, *relativley, stabalized, emissions Though, tempororilly*) only when using sophisticated language.

Global warming has been an international issue since the 1800's, ~~where~~ when industrialization began. Despite the belief of some political figures, global warming and climate change are all too real, and the effects can be seen everywhere. Scientists have been researching ways to stop global warming and, more importantly, ~~reduce~~ reverse the effects. Recently, a new idea has been brought to the table concerning this topic. The use of solar engineering. Solar engineering is described as "a group of hypothetical technologies that could, in theory, counteract temperature rise by reflecting more sunlight away from the Earth's surface" (Text 1, lines 5-7). While these theories are ambitious, they may be too ambitious to become reality. Solar geoengineering should not be used to reduce global warming because it poses a moral hazard and only addresses the symptoms of global warming, not the causes.

The term 'moral hazard' is mostly used in economics. It is described as "the temptation for people to make risker decisions when they feel protected from the consequences" (Text 3, lines 12-13). When applying this idea to solar geoengineering,

~~One~~ the year is that if the dangers of Solar engineering are glossed over and only the positives are talked about, support for emission risk reduction will decrease. The best way to illustrate ~~these~~ this 'positive over negative' year is to provide an example. One Solar engineering theroy is to "inject 25,000 tons of sulfur-as finely dispersed sulfuric acid, for example, into the lower stratosphere." (Text 2, lines 4-5) This would reflects most of the sun's light away from the Earth, effectivly cooling it down. Surface level, this theroy seems appealing. However, the backlash of this method is that it would 'probably "contribute to thousands of air pollution deaths a year," (Text 2, lines 34-35). This is because "Solar geoengineering doesnt effect the amount of CO_2 in the air, leading to the continued increase in air pollution, perhaps even more drastically.

This builds the platform for my second claim: solar geoengineering only prevents the symptoms of global warming. If we truly want to stop global warming, we must focus on the ~~prob~~ cause of the problem. This connects back to the moral hazard of Solar geoengineering, "that instead of dealing with the causes of behind climate change directly, humans would fall back

on solar geoengineering." (Text 3, lines 9-10). ~~If the negati~~ The glorifying of solar geoengineering would make this more likely to happen. If we merely put a lid on the planet, that doesn't ~~st~~ solve the problem of global warming. It merely delays the effects and can possibly cause more problems.

Some argue that solar geoengineering should be used to combat global warming. A popular theory of ~~sea~~ solar geoengineering is the method of spraying aerosols high up into the stratosphere. It is ~~the~~ said to "cool the planet in a similar way to a large volcanic eruption" (Text 1, lines 28-29) While several stimulations have been done to test this and other solar geo-engineering ~~the~~ theories, the biggest flaw is that there ~~is~~ isn't enough information available to accurately predict the effects these methods may have on the atmosphere.

Overall, solar geoengineering is an ambitious idea one that has captured the attention and time of scientists around the world. However, there ~~are~~ are still too many unanswered questions about this theory, and not enough research to prove that it is safe to

distribute globally. For now, humanity
Should stick to hacking away at the
cause of ~~real-life~~ the problem; fossil fuels.

Anchor Level 5–B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Solar geoengineering should not be used to reduce global warming because it poses a moral hazard and only addresses the symptoms of global warming, not the causes*).
- The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*When applying this idea to solar geoengineering, the fear is that if the dangers of solar engineering are glossed over and only the positives are talked about, support for emission risk reduction will decrease* and *This is because solar geoengineering doesnt affect the amount of CO_2 in the air, leading to the continued increase in air pollution, perhaps even more drastically*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some argue that solar geoengineering should be used to combat global warming. A popular theroy … is the method of spraying aerosols … into the stratosphere*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*The term 'moral hazard' is mostly used in economics. It is described as "the temptation for people to make riskier decisions when they feel protected from the consequences"* and *However, the backlash of this method is that it would "probably contribute to thousands of air pollution deaths a year"*).
- The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 1, lines 5–7*) and (*Text 3, lines 12–13*)].

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces the issue and establishes a claim opposed to the use of solar geoengineering, followed by two supportive paragraphs that focus on the use of solar geoengineering as a '*moral hazard*' and how it *only prevents the symptoms* as opposed to the need to *focus on the cause of the problem*, then followed by a paragraph that further addresses the counterclaim by pointing out a *flaw* in a *popular theroy*, and a conclusion of summation (*However, there are still too many unanswered questions about this theroy, and not enough research to prove that it is safe to distribute globally*).
- The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*Despite the belief of some political figures, global warming and climate change are all too real, and the effects can be seen everywhere* and *This builds the platform for my second claim: solar geoengineering only prevents the symptoms of global warming*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*The use of solar engineering. Solar; theroy; theroies; The term … consequences"; effectivly; surface level, this; doesnt; gloryfyng*) that do not hinder comprehension.

As our global temperature continues to rapidly increase, so does our demand for a solution. One tactic which could be used in order to combat Global warming is solar geoengineering. In order to have a healthy and sustainable future, actions must be taken to protect our environment

solar geoengineering could be described as, "... A term used to describe a group of hypothetical technologies that could, in theory, counteract temperature rise by reflecting more sunlight away from the Earths surface." (Text 1, l. 5-7) By sending this technology into space, many environmental advantages would emerge. In theory, the overall global temperature would remain the same, and stop the continous warming. Because of this, organisms and their ecosystems would be able to prosper without the effects of climate change.

Some may argue that solar geoengineering would not be a good solution to reducing global warming, however this is false. some argue that solar geoengineering is to expensive. Text 2 states, "He estimates this scheme would cost about 700 million annually." (Text 2 l. 14-15) This

belief is absurd. No cost is ~~huge~~ to high when discussing our ~~own~~ Earth and its future. A healthy and sustainable environment and future is only achievable through personal efforts and money. Also, spending more money preventing climate change now could in turn save worldwide economies in the future. Text 4 states, "Economists have estimated that global climate change could result in worldwide economic damage of more than 1 trillion dollars per year later this century." ~~geoengineering project could~~ (Text 4 l. 11-12) Overall, both the economy and environment would be ~~pos~~ tively impacted long term.

Global climate change effects all people, organisms, and ecosystems. In order to secure a safe future, changes and solutions must be implemented. Solar geoengineering could be this solution that changes the world.

Anchor Level 4–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*One tactic which could be used in order to combat Global warming is solar geoengineering*).
- The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Because of this, organisms and their ecosystems would be able to prosper without the effects of climate change* and *Overall, both the economy and environment would be positivly impacted long term*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Some may argue that solar geoengineering is to expensive … This belief is absurd. No cost is to high when discussing our Earth and its future*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Solar geoengineering could be discribed as, "…A term used to discribe a group of hypothetical technologies that could, in theory, counteract temperature rise by reflecting more sunlight away from the Earths surface"*; "*He estimates this scheme would cost about 700 million annually*; *Text 4 states, "Economists have estimated that global climate change could result in worldwide economic damage of more than 1 trillion dollars per year later this century"*).
- The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 1, 1. 5–7*) and (*Text 4 1. 11–12*)].

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that presents a claim, followed by a paragraph that defines and then supports the claim (*By sending this technology into space, many environmental advantages would emerge*). A third paragraph addresses an opposing claim (*Some may argue that solar geoengineering would not be a good solution*). The summative conclusion reaffirms the claim (*Solar geoengineering could be this solution that changes the world*).
- The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*As our global temperature continues to rapidly increase, so does our demand for a solution* and *A healthy and sustainable environment and future is only achievable through personal efforts and money*), despite a few errors in word choice (*to* for "too" and *effects* for "affects").

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*environment Solar; discribed; as, "...A term; Earths surface."* (*Text 1,1. 5–7*) *By; same, and stop; continous; warming, however this; positivly*) that do not hinder comprehension.

When asked the question, "should solar geoengineering be used to reduce global warming..." your response would probably be a quick yes but do you really know what that entails..? Your answer should be a hard no when asked that.

One reason solar geoengineering should not be used is because it would be using tons of millions of other chemicals. With physicist David Keith's "scheme" it would entail, "A fleet of 10 Gulfstream jets.. to annually inject 25,000 tons of sulfer... into the lower stratosphere... up to a million tons.. by 2070." (Text 2, lines 4-6). All those chemicals and it would only counteract up to 1/2 the warming from greenhouse gas alone. That's not going to do a whole lot in the long run.

Another reason geoengineering should not be used is because it can become deadly. "Putting a million tons of sulfur into the stratosphere each year would...", in David Keith's words, "... contribute to thousands of air pollution deaths a year" (Text 2, lines 34/35). From trying to save the planet from global warming, it

would also destroy lives on Earth in the process.

Also, a third reason is because, not only could it become deadly, it could, in the long run, destroy our planet. [redacted] "..Sulfates could lead to the destruction of ozone", our protective layer from ultraviolet rays. (Text 3, lines 43/44). Which would be the biggest/most serious side effect from solar geo-engineering.

However, some would argue in favor of this solar engineering. They would say that, "..stratospheric aerosol injection could cool the planet" (Text 1, lines 28/29) and help with climate control and global warming. But that's all they would see. They'd only focus on the positive side and not even see all the dangers by using solar geo-engineering.

Overall, solar geoengineering is a no-go. While it could help for a little while, it's costly, deadly, and would destroy our planet. Then what would we do.. Where would we go..

it won't last long or forever...

Anchor Level 4–B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*When asked the question, "Should solar geoengineering be used to reduce global warming…"… Your answer should be a hard no*).
- The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*All those chemicals and it would only counteract up to ½ the warming from greenhouse gas alone. That's not going to do a whole lot in the long run* and *From trying to save the planet from global warming, it would also destroy lives on Earth in the process*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However, some would argue in favor of this solar engineering. They would say that, "…Stratospheric aerosol injection could cool the planet"*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*With physicist David Keith's "scheme" it would entail,* "*A fleet of 10 Gulfstream jets..to annually inject 25,000 tons of sulfer…into the lower stratosphere…up to a million tons..by 2070*" and "*..Sulfates could lead to the destruction of ozone*").
- The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 2, lines 4–6*) and (*Text 1, lines 28/29*)].

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces the claim, followed by three paragraphs that support the claim (*One reason solar geoengineering should not be used is because it would be using tons of millions of other chemicals; Another reason geoengineering should not be used is because it can become deadly; Also, a third reason is because, not only could it become deadly, it could, in the long run, destroy our planet*). A fourth body paragraph addresses an opposing claim, and the essay ends with a summative conclusion that reaffirms the claim (*Overall, solar geoengineering is a no-go*).
- The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*a hard no, tons of millions, in the long run, But that's all they would see, dangers by using, a no-go*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*warming…" your; yes but; chemicals and; Which would; that,".. Stratospheric; forever…*) that do not hinder comprehension.