

FOR TEACHERS ONLY

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

ELA

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Wednesday, June 19, 2019—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 <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/> and select the link "Scoring Information" for any recently posted information regarding this examination. This site should be checked before the rating process for this examination begins and several times throughout the Regents Examination period.

The following procedures are to be used for rating papers in the Regents Examination in English Language Arts. 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 from high to low within each score level.)

Practice Scoring Individually

- Raters score a set of five practice papers individually. Raters should score the five papers independently without looking at the scores provided after the five papers.
- Trainer records scores and leads discussion until raters feel comfortable enough to move on to actual scoring. (Practice papers for Parts 2 and 3 only contain scores, not commentaries.)

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

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



**New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts
Part 2 Rubric
Writing From Sources: Argument**

Criteria	6 Essays at this Level:	5 Essays at this Level:	4 Essays at this Level:	3 Essays at this Level:	2 Essays at this Level:	1 Essays at this Level:
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.

Pets have been a part of the typical American family and have been for longer than you or I can even begin to remember. Whether it be Chipper, loyal dog who stays by your side - or the lazy, sassy cat who never listens to your well thought out and simple instructions, pets play a pivotal role in the growth and happiness of people. - a source of bonding and love for those who care for them. Perhaps because of this, in this increasingly open-minded and progressive world, people have begun to wonder... What if we can bring that same sense of joy to the American workplace? As a result, in the past few years we have seen an ever increasing allowance of pets in massive companies such as Google and in some hospitals. Yet, the question still remains - is this a good idea? Is it viable? The answer, sadly, is no, it is not. Pets should not be allowed into the workplace because the added cost, lack of research and education, as well as numerous issues pets may cause in terms of allergies and potential fighting far outweigh the benefits from a logistical standpoint and could pave the way for a more chaotic, dysfunctional and unsafe workplace.

First and foremost, a company's prerogative is always going to be to make money and to spend as little as they can when they are able to. Therefore, with this tidbit of information in mind, one must now look at what it would cost to bring a pet into the office and provide for it. Companies would be forced into stocking their "workplace with at least basic pet supplies like snacks, water bowls, kitty litter, and chew toys" (Text 2, lines 36-37). These added costs for pets add not only another unnecessary burden on the companies, but also drive up expenses unnecessarily. Furthermore, the presence of pets in the workplace may lead to serious recruitment issues and, once again, unnecessary hindrances in today's working

environment "with the market for talented and qualified workers already^{so} scarce, adding an extra filter to your recruitment process may not be the smartest idea from a competitive perspective" (Text 2, lines 40-42). These added obstacles for companies overpower the slight morale boost workers may gain from taking their pet to work and are the fundamental cause of why this policy would not be able to function on a widespread basis.

Yes, there are many who would counter these assertions and say the benefits of this practice are far greater than just a morale boost. These individuals may point to a Banfield Pet Hospital survey regarding pets in the workplace that came to the following conclusion: "The majority of workers in pet-friendly workplaces consider the policy to be positive. A full 91 percent of managers and 82 percent of employees felt workers became more loyal... a large majority felt it made the workplace more productive, and 86 percent of workers and 92 percent of management reported decreased worker stress levels" (Text 1, lines 23-27). Another benefit of having pets in the workplace is the "documented positive effects on blood pressure, cholesterol levels and the immune system" (Text 1, lines 38-39).

However, it seems that there are other means for these workers to achieve these same results while the 15% to 30% of the total American population who suffer from one form of a pet allergy or another, or are simply afraid of animals, are being selfishly ignored. These individuals may be deprived of certain job opportunities in order to avoid allergic reactions that may cause "rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks and even severe respiratory disorders" (Text 2, lines 15-19) and, in turn, companies may be deprived of efficient and well-qualified

workers. Not only are these individuals' needs being ignored, but what of the animals who are being forced to be still in an office throughout the day and subjected to a variety of strangers who may or may not understand their body language? According to veterinary behaviorists E'lise Christensen and Bonnie Beaver, this could lead to boredom, fear and stress for the animal which might manifest itself in unexpected or unwanted behaviors such as biting or chewing on furniture (Text 4, lines 14-22).

While the open-minded and progressive people ~~are~~ have proposed that pets be allowed in the workplace, it appears evident that this is not a viable policy as such a policy puts all at risk. "Rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies are all potential health risks for humans that come into contact with pets that haven't been properly vetted" (Text 4, lines 29-30). In reality, there is no guarantee that animals brought into the workplace have been properly examined. Furthermore, not only would this policy put an unnecessary increased burden upon a company's budget, but it can also prove detrimental to employees already suffering from allergies and to the animals themselves. Therefore, it only makes sense, that pets remain home or at day care and, most definitely, out of the workplace.

Anchor Level 6–A

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*Pets should not be allowed into the workplace because the added cost, lack of research and education, as well as numerous issues pets may cause in terms of allergies and potential fighting far outweigh the benefits from a logistical standpoint and could pave the way for a more chaotic, dysfunctional, and unsafe workplace*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Furthermore, the presence of pets in the workplace may lead to serious recruitment issues and, once again, unnecessary hindrances in today’s working environment and However, it seems that there are other means for these workers to achieve these same results*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Yes, there are many who would counter these assertions and say the benefits of this practice are far greater than just a morale boost*). The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*“with the market for talented and qualified workers already so scarce, adding an extra filter to your recruitment process may not be the smartest idea from a competitive perspective”* and *Another benefit of having pets in the workplace is the “documented positive effects on blood pressure, cholesterol levels and the immune system”*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 2, lines 36-37*) and (*Text 1, lines 38-39*)]. The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that states the claim and lists reasons why pets should be kept out of the workplace, then presents a second paragraph that addresses the *added cost* and recruitment issues, and introduces a counterclaim (*the slight morale boost workers may gain*), then presents a paragraph of counterclaim rebuttal, followed by a paragraph that addresses potential physical and psychological effects on both workers and animals, ending with a summary conclusion. The use of transitions is skillful (*First and foremost; Yes, there are; However, it seems*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using sophisticated language and structure (*While the open open-minded and progressive people have proposed that pets be allowed in the workplace, it appears evident that this is not a viable policy as such a policy puts all at risk*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language.

A large percentage of people in the world are pet owners. There are guide dogs, trained health-care animals, as well as pets who were simply adopted to be companions. Pets are seen in homes, on the street, and now in offices. Major companies like Amazon and Google have begun to allow employees to bring their pets to work. They are viewed as calming motivators, and each year, more and more companies are allowing pets in the office. Despite this trend, pets should not be allowed in the workplace because this practice is unsafe, unsanitary, and potentially harmful to the animals as well.

Bringing pets into the workplace is medically unsafe, as well as unsanitary. Some animals carry diseases or parasites. According to E'lee Christensen, a board-certified veterinary behaviorist, "Each new animal, like cats or pot-bellied pigs, brings its own social complexities, not to mention the possibilities of contagious disease (it's rare that employers require proof of vaccination). Rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies are all potential health risks for humans that come into contact with pets that haven't been properly vetted" (Text 4, lines 27-30). By bringing a pet into the workplace, the risk of a disease spreading between pets and people is much more likely as all are together in a restricted environment. In places like hospitals, a pet is even more dangerous to patients who are already in a weakened state. This, however, is an easily avoided risk, which must be considered. Besides disease concerns, pets are often unsanitary which can lead to further problems. Animals easily track mud, dust, and dirt wherever they go. Young animals may not be fully potty-trained which can further pose both health and cleanliness issues. Text 1 states, "Even potty-trained pets can have an accident now and then" (Text 1, lines 47-48). Dealing with messes and accidents left by pets is an unnecessary problem

in a workplace. By leaving pets at home, the safety and cleanliness of a workplace will be improved.

While it is said that pets can be helpful to people in the workplace by relieving stress, those that say this do not take into consideration that going to an office each day may be harmful to the pets. People are incapable of fully understanding what a pet is thinking. With this in mind, it is not wise to take an animal out of its normal environment and bring it to a place of new, unfamiliar people and animals. The safety and well-being of pets is an important factor to most pet owners, and must be considered when determining whether or not to allow animals in an office. Pets won't be free to wander as they do at home, and closed conditions may make a pet uncomfortable as "generally, dogs are expected to sit still in an office setting, which can be difficult for active dogs..." (Text 4, lines 20-21). By taking an animal to work, the animal is made nervous from the change in routine, and uncomfortable from the tight quarters it's being placed in. Thus, to truly protect the well-being of these animals, they must not be taken to work.

However, there are some who disagree and point out that bringing animals to work can improve worker productivity and communication. They see animals as an "ice breaker" that may "lead to some inspiring brainstorm conversations as well as an increase in camaraderie" (Text 3, lines 33 and 37-38). While this may be true for some, there is a large number of people who are afraid of or allergic to certain animals, making the workplace an uncomfortable place to be. For those people, animals in the workplace ^{can} create health and emotional problems, which could cause their productivity to drop and may even be the determining factor on whether or not they stay with that company.

Bringing an animal to the workplace is unsafe, ~~and~~ unsanitary,

and potentially harmful to the animals. Diseases can quickly be spread through pets to other pets and people. Pets can leave messes and accidents, making a work place much less clean and inviting. Unfamiliar conditions can cause an animal to feel uncomfortable, and animals may cause people to be uncomfortable. Thus, animals must not be brought into the workplace.

Anchor Level 6–B

The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim, as directed by the task (*Despite this trend, pets should not be allowed in the workplace because this practice is unsafe, unsanitary, and potentially harmful to the animals as well*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*By bringing a pet into the workplace, the risk of a disease spreading between pets and people is much more likely and By taking an animal to work, the animal is made nervous from the change in routine, and uncomfortable from the tight quarters it's being placed in*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However, there are some who disagree and point out that bringing animals to work can improve worker productivity and communication and While this may be true for some, there is a large number of people who are afraid of or allergic to certain animals, making the workplace an uncomfortable place to be*). The essay presents ideas fully and thoughtfully, making highly effective use of a wide range of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*closed conditions may make a pet uncomfortable as “generally, dogs are expected to sit still in an office setting, which can be difficult for active dogs...” and They see animals as an “ice breaker” that may “lead to some inspiring brainstorm conversations as well as an increase in camaraderie”*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 4, lines 27-30*) and (*Text 1, lines 47-48*)]. 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 claim, followed by one body paragraph that focuses on the *unsafe* and *unsanitary* aspects of having pets in the workplace, a second and third that refute the counterclaims of stress relief and improved *worker productivity and communication* with arguments presenting the negative impact that having pets in the workplace can have on both the animals and the workers, and concluding paragraph that restates the claim and summarizes the arguments supporting the claim (*Bringing an animal to the workplace is unsafe, unsanitary, and potentially harmful to the animals*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*This, however, is an easily avoided risk, which must be considered*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors, even with using sophisticated language.

The modern workplace is the center of many debates. Sexual harassments, racism, and the encroachment of technology on jobs are all topics that have come up in the working world. Compared to these, the discussion over whether pets should be allowed in the workplace seems to be uncontroversial to the point of being dull. But in fact, many people have clashing opinions over whether and how the growing movement of taking one's pets to work should continue. Although there should be some adjustments to the current program, it would probably be beneficial if some workplaces allowed their employees to bring their pets to work.

A key reason for bringing pets to work are the psychological benefits. Having a parakeet to chat with or a fluffy friend to hug creates a more positive atmosphere, which in turn increases loyalty to and productivity for the company. Lines 26-27 of Text 1 remark how a study showed that "86 percent of workers and 92 percent of management reported decreased worker stress levels" following the implementation of the policy. Having pets around also improves worker communication by giving people topics of discussion and shared interests, since "walking or being near a dog is an excellent ice-breaker" (Text 3, line 33). The presence of pets in the workplace can lead to closer emotional bonds or even valuable brainstorming between workers. Having pets hanging around can leave workers, and by extension their employers, much more satisfied and stress-free. Besides the pleasant psychological effects, having pets around can also have a positive impact on one's physical wellbeing. Petting a cat or dog can have healthy side effects. According to Text 3, they can range from

"lowering blood pressure to increasing bone density" (line 22). Pets also increase employee exercise, since walking dogs or feeding cats requires employees to move around more than they would just sitting at their computers. Having pets around also leads to more bodies being in the workplaces since younger workers like having pets around even more than their older counterparts. Furthermore, workers of all ages are less likely to rush through work or request shorter hours when they don't need to worry about caring for household pets. As a result, both companies and their employees flourish.

Of course, having pets around isn't all cuddles and bickson. Text 2 raises a legitimate concern about workers who have a bad physical or psychological reaction to having animals around. For example, "15% to 20%" (Text 2, line 17) of the total American population has some kind of pet allergy, and there are those who are genuinely troubled by the presence of animals. Also, the pets themselves may fare badly in the workplace. Many industries, such as mining or medicine, contain elements which are hazardous to pets. Contact between humans and unvaccinated pets runs the risk of spreading "rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies" (Text 4, line 29). Furthermore, restrictive spaces or erratic schedules may lead dogs, a favorite American pet, to suffer psychologically and display bad behavior in the workplace. This is especially a problem due a general human illiteracy in the intricacies of dog body language, causing people to do things like misinterpret "a sign of nervousness" (Text 4, line 14) for a "friendly smile" (Text 4, line 14). These are all valid concerns, and need to be taken seriously. Such difficulties can be rectified by using videos to teach pet owners

how to identify physical or psychological discomfort among their mate companions, Also, laws should be passed forbidding dogs to be in areas where there's a significant risk of their coming to harm. Furthermore, only well-trained, vaccinated and vaccinated pets that do not cause allergies should be allowed in the workplace. These measures will not render the office-pets movement flawless, but it will hopefully smooth the way somewhat.

Although there should be adjustments to the current program, it would probably be beneficial if some workplaces allowed their employees to bring their pets to work. Pets have positive psychological and physical effects on the humans around them. They also help improve a company's productivity and employee amount. Of course pets, like their owners, are imperfect creatures. The road to a pet-friendly workplace will not be easy, but the result could be magnificent.

Anchor Level 5–A

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Although there should be some adjustments to the current program, it would probably be beneficial if some workplaces allowed their employees to bring their pets to work*). The essay demonstrates in-depth and insightful analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*The presence of pets in the workplace can lead to closer emotional bonds or even valuable brainstorming between workers* and *Furthermore, workers of all ages are less likely to rush through work or request shorter hours when they don't need to worry about caring for housebound pets*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*restrictive spaces or erratic schedules may lead dogs, a favorite American pet, to suffer psychologically and display bad behavior in the workplace. This is especially a problem due to a general human illiteracy in the intricacies of dog body language*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making highly effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Having pets around also improves worker communication by giving people topics of discussion and shared interests, since "walking or being near a dog is an excellent ice-breaker"* and *Many industries, such as mining or medicine, contain elements which are hazardous to pets. Contact between humans and unvaccinated pets runs the risk of spreading "Rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies"* and *people ... misinterpret "A sign of nervousness" ... for a "friendly smile"*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 2, line 17*) and (*Text 4, line 29*)]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an introductory paragraph that establishes the claim, followed by paragraphs that focus on the psychological and physical benefits of bringing pets to the workplace (*creates a more positive atmosphere and increase employee exercise*), then moving to a paragraph that addresses a counterclaim (*Text 2 raises a legitimate concern about workers who have a bad physical or psychological reaction to having animals around*), effectively dismissing this counterclaim by suggesting the need for hypoallergenic pets, video training, and pet screening. The essay concludes with a reiteration of the claim and a summary of key points that support the claim, creating a cohesive and coherent essay. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*The modern workplace is the center of many debates: sexual harassment, racism, and the encroachment of technology on jobs are all topics that have come up in the working world*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*reason ... are, misinterpret, measures ... it*) only when using sophisticated language.

Pets in the workplace are increasing, and that is a very good thing. Not only are they cute, they improve worker productivity and relieve stress. Pets should be allowed in the workplaces that ~~all~~ are ^{able} ~~to~~ to have them there, so long as ~~the~~ ~~pets~~ the pets behave and their owners watch them very closely. Studies have shown that having pets in the workplace increases productivity and improves the health of the employees. As long as the pets are ~~more~~ safe, having them there is much more beneficial than leaving them at home. If pets are banned from all workplaces, employees will be less productive and will suffer from greater health concerns.

Employees are more productive when they bring their pets to work. All workers (both pet owners and non-pet owners) claimed they experienced "higher...job satisfaction," which would cause higher productivity (Text 1, line 35). In addition, a study done in 2012 revealed that employees ^{thought they} were "50 percent more productive with the presence of their pets," (Text 3, lines 41-42). They claimed to be this much more productive, so the actual increase may have been slightly smaller, but it is still significant. Another positive aspect of having pets in the workplace is their impact on employee communication and camaraderie. This is important to increase creativity and will increase the overall quality of the

work. Lastly, workers are more likely to stay at "the office" longer if their pets are with them because it eliminates the guilt felt when pets are left all alone. This increases the amount of work being done but also increases the quality of the work because the employee will not be wishing home to let their pet outside (Text 3, lines 15-16). They also don't have to pay for someone to watch their pet, which will encourage them to stay at the office longer.

As well as improving the productivity of employees, having pets in the workplace also improves the health of employees. Pets in the workplace decrease stress levels among employees, which leads to workers not using as many of their sick days (Text 1, line 8). Other health benefits of having pets in the workplace include lowered blood pressure, lowered cholesterol levels and a stronger immune system (Text 1, lines 38-39). This, in turn, helps with productivity because it causes a decrease in the amount of sick days being used by employees.

Of course, having pets in the workplace isn't a perfect idea. People with severe allergies to animals may experience "rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks, and even severe respiratory disorders," (Text 2, lines 18-19). This could be settled by having areas where pets are not allowed. There could also be regulations in place that dictate ~~the~~ ^{which}

kinds of pets are able to go to work with their owners. For example, "hypoallergenic" dogs do not shed as much as "regular" dogs and could cause less harm on someone who is allergic.

Another problem with bringing pets to work is the lack of thought that goes into the decision.

"When an employer is on board, the policy is often as informal as a person in charge saying, 'Yeah, sure, whatever. Bring your dogs. It'll be great.'" (Text 4, lines 33-34). This could cause issues because not all dogs (or all pets) are suited for an office. Dogs that bite or are very energetic would not be a good fit, for example. This can be solved by having the pets that would be a good fit come to the office. Also, employees should be required to do some sort of training to learn animal body language (which can be as simple as watching a few videos) ~~Text~~ Health records should also be required, including immunization records to prevent contagious disease (Text 4, lines 40-42).

As long as there are regulations regarding bringing pets into work, it is a very good idea and benefits the employees greatly. It increases productivity and improves health. When done properly (carefully and considerately), it can improve ~~our~~ a working environment greatly.

Anchor Level 5–B

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Pets should be allowed in the workplaces that are able to have them there and If pets are banned from all workplaces, employees will be less productive and will suffer from greater health concerns*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*This, in turn, helps with productivity because it causes a decrease in the amount of sick days being used by employees and There could also be regulations in place that dictate which kinds of pets are able to go to work with their owners*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Of course, having pets in the workplace isn't a perfect idea. People with severe allergies to animals may experience ... severe respiratory disorders*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*In addition, a study done in 2012 revealed that employees thought they were "50 percent more productive with the presence of their pets" and Other health benefits of having pets in the workplace include lowered blood pressure, lowered cholesterol levels and a stronger immune system*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*Text 1, line 35*] and [*Text 2, lines 18-19*]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an opening paragraph that introduces the issue of whether or not pets should be allowed in the workplace and establishing a claim, followed by two paragraphs of support that focus on how having pets in the workplace improves employee *productivity* and *health* and one paragraph that presents and refutes the counterclaim, with a concluding paragraph that reaffirms the claim (*As long as there are regulations regarding bringing pets into work, it is a very good idea and benefits the employees greatly*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*As well as improving the productivity of employees, having pets in the workplace also improves the health of employees*). The essay demonstrates control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*cameraderie, employee ... their, harm on someone, records to*) only when using sophisticated language.

Staring into the face of your pet can bring you immeasurable joy and such a joy requires care and safety, for both you and your pet. In the workplace, pet friendly environments are expanding mostly in office related jobs. A pet from an employee may be brought in for the day for the pleasure of all. Although the owner is taking care of the pet, the presence of the pet increases the risk of animal related problems such as allergies a human might have or a behavioral problem the pet might exhibit. Pet friendly environments are a source of animal related issues and cause a higher risk for the safety of the pet. Therefore, pets should not be allowed in the work place.

The idea of a pet friendly work environment has good intentions but inevitably leads to a greater risk in inducing stress and inciting problems between workers and pets. In Text 2 it's recorded that the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America estimates that "15% to 30% of the total [American] population" have some form of a pet allergy (Text 2, line 17). Exposing workers constantly to the animal that gives them their allergy can be a detriment to their work environment and their health. Even though pet friendly offices were found to improve "the atmosphere in the workplace significantly" (Text 1, lines 21-22), employees with allergies would experience a negative effect and have trouble getting work done. Pets also require hygienic care while in the office. With a large quantity of animals existing in the workplace

"there is no guarantee this [accident] won't happen" (Text 1, line 48). An animal related accident shifts the atmosphere in the office from fun and cute to unpleasant and unhealthy. Some people dislike animals as well. Thus, for these workers who have phobias or allergies "pets in the workplace... encroach upon [their] productivity and quality of life" (Text 1, lines 44-45). The danger of pets in the workplace is that it can hinder work performance and lead to new problems a worker may not otherwise have to worry about such as the hygiene of a pet in the office.

Bringing a dog or any new kind of animal to the workplace is generally unsafe for the dog as well. In a work environment, dogs are "expected to sit still" which leads to boredom then "to problem behaviors like chewing up desk legs" (Text 4, lines 20-22). This action of making a dog "sit still" is hard for active dogs and harms their active and healthy lifestyle. Even though "workers can watch their furry friend while in the office" (Text 3, lines 16-17), keeping a pet in the office can induce fear and stress in the animal. Some workers "do not understand dog body language" (Text 4, line 9) and "cannot reliably identify things in between" (Text 4, lines 15-16) when it comes to emotions like fear and anger. Experiencing constant fear, stress or poor hygiene can leave it unhappy and may even shorten its life.

A pet friendly environment does, however, come with some high rewards. A workplace with pets has been known to cause a significant

decrease in stress, causing employees to be "more productive and miss fewer days" (Text 1, line 8). Having an animal mascot or friendly pets around can make employees feel more loyal and happy. Banfield Pet Hospital surveyed these pet friendly workplaces and found "91 percent of managers and 82 percent of employees felt that workers become more loyal to the company with this policy" (Text 1, lines 23-24), which also helps improve morale.

In spite of the above benefits, the health and safety reasons are more than enough to keep all pets away from the workplace. Pets may create a friendly environment to workers and lower their stress, but pets aren't the only means of fixing stress issues whereas those with allergies and phobias have much more serious issues to deal with. The safety of an owners pet should be the first priority of the owner, and bringing their pets to their work breaches their overall safety, as well as that of the people around them. So, no, pets should not be allowed in the workplace.

Anchor Level 5–C

The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim, as directed by the task (*Pet friendly environments are a source of animal related issues and cause a higher risk for the safety of the pet. Therefore, pets should not be allowed in the work place*). The essay demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*An animal related accident shifts the atmosphere in the office from fun and cute to unpleasant and unhealthy*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*A pet friendly environment does, however, come with some high rewards* and *In spite of the above benefits, the health and safety reasons are more than enough to keep all pets away from the workplace*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*In Text 2 it's recorded that the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America estimates that "15% to 30% of the total [American] population" have some form of a pet allergy and Thus, for these workers who have phobias or allergies "pets in the the workplace ... encroach upon [their] productivity and quality of life"*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(*Text 1, line 48*) and (*Text 3, lines 16-17*)]. The essay exhibits logical organization of ideas and information to create a cohesive and coherent essay, with an introduction that introduces a negative claim, followed by two paragraphs of support, one that focuses on the *risk of stress and inciting problems between workers and pets*, and a second that focuses on the lack of safety for a dog. A third body paragraph presents the counterclaim which is refuted in a concluding paragraph that also reaffirms the claim (*The safety of an owners pet should be the first prority of the owner ... as well as that of the people around them. So, no, pets should not be allowed in the workplace*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using fluent and precise language and sound structure (*A workplace with pets has been known to cause a significant decrease in stress causing employees to be "more productive and miss fewer days"*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*immessurable, prescence, detrement, hygine, boredom then, an owners pet, prority*) that do not hinder comprehension.

Over the years, bringing your pet to your workplace has become more and more popular. However, some people are not happy with that decision. Bringing your pet to work may cause some unwanted side effects. People who have allergies may have an allergic reaction to someone bringing their pet to their workplace. Also, a pet may influence the development of the product that your company is making, it may even cause harm to the person's pet. The only positive impact that comes from this is the fact that it reduces stress. In this case, the negatives outweighs the positives.

Many people suffer from allergies today, some of which occur based on pets. Whenever someone is bringing their pet to their workplace, they are unaware if their pet triggers an allergic reaction from a colleague, or customer. "Some of these allergies are so severe that they cause rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks, and even severe respiratory disorders." (text 2, lines 17-19). People have no clue whatsoever if they are going to trigger a small response from someone, or a huge response, solely on the fact that they have brought their pet to their working environment. "Babies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies are all potential health risks for humans that come into contact with pets that haven't been properly vetted." (text 4, lines 29-30). Another side effect from bringing a pet to a person's job is that it can cause a person to encounter a disease or issue that they haven't had before, as presented.

By bringing your pet to work, you're risking the

development of the product you're making, and the quality of it as well." ... could cause pets in the workplace to encroach upon productivity and quality of life for these individuals." (text 1, lines 44-46). "... businesses are all sectors where a pet can be a serious threat to the quality of the final product or service." (text 2, lines 26-27). You may not know it, but a pet could most definitely influence how your product turns out. "Industries like construction, mining, refineries, and more can be dangerous for your pet's health and well-being." (text 2, lines 30-31). Dangerous jobs, such as these, can have an negative impact on your pet.

There is something positive that comes with bringing your pet to work. In doing so, you may be able to reduce the stress you have at work. "Employees who are less stressed at work are more productive and miss fewer days due to being sick." (text 1, lines 7-8). Many people who have brought their pet to their workplace have shown signs of improvement. "Multiple studies have shown that simply petting cats or dogs can be extremely beneficial for our health; from lowering blood pressure to increasing bone density." (text 3, lines 30-31). Whenever you take your pet to work, you don't have to deal with the guilt that comes with leaving your pet at home. However, not all people react the same way. Just because some people find it to be soothing, doesn't mean that other people will. Some may even find it to be more of a handful.

In conclusion, people are entitled to their own opinion. Not everyone reacts the same way, and may have a

different approach to a specific situation. Whether or not pets should be allowed in the workplace is a debatable topic amongst people. In my opinion, I believe that pets should not be allowed to the workplace. It causes allergies, diseases, it could even cause harm to the owner or the pet. The only positive is that it reduces stress, and there's only a small chance of it doing that. The downfalls just far outweigh the benefits.

Anchor Level 4-A

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Bringing your pet to work may cause some unwanted side effects. People who have allergies may have an allergic reaction to someone bringing their pet to their workplace. Also, a pet may influence the development of the product that your company is making and the negatives outweighs the positives*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*By bringing your pet to work, you're risking the development of the product you're making, and the quality of it as well*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*There is something positive that comes with bringing your pet to work. In doing so, you may be able to reduce the stress you have at work ... Just because some people find it to be soothing, doesn't mean that other people will*). The essay presents ideas clearly and accurately, making effective use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*"Rabies, ringworm, and parasitic infections like scabies are all potential health risks for humans that come into contact with pets that haven't been properly vetted"* and *"Industries like construction, mining, refineries, and more can be dangerous for your pet's health and well-being"*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(text 2, lines 17-19) and (text 4, lines 29-30)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, first introducing the *downfalls* of bringing pets to work, followed by two body paragraphs supporting the claim, one paragraph presenting a counterclaim and a summative conclusion (*I believe that pets should not be allowed to the workplace*). The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*The only positive impact that comes from this is the fact that it reduces stress* and *The downfalls just far outweigh the benefits*) with a few lapses (*you're* for "you" and *more of a handful*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors [*someone ... their, persons' pet, negatives outweighs, positives, disorders.*] (text, *enroach*) that do not hinder comprehension.

There are a lot of different opinions on if pets should be allowed in the workplace. I ~~believe~~^{believe} that pets should be allowed as they provide many benefits to humans. However some would argue that they don't.

Pets should be allowed in the workplace for various ~~reas~~^{reasons}. One is that multiple studies have shown that they provide a lot of benefits to not only the employee's but to the company itself. Studies have shown "how they reduce blood pressure and lower stress, how pets at the workplace make employees more creative, productive, and cordial to each other and how they're such awesome additions to our lives overall" (Text 2, lines 2-5). This shows that ~~they~~^{there} are multiple benefits to the employees if there are pets in the workplace. Another way pets can benefit the workplace is they can influence conversations throughout the workplace. Just like when you take your dog for a walk and you get more interactions from people around you "Shifting to a pet-friendly ~~of~~ workplace can bring that same level of open and enthusiastic communication into the office" (Text 3, lines 34-35). It would influence conversations at times that normally may be ~~abuse~~^{awkward}. This would be good because you want the employees to interact and communicate while at work.

However some people would argue that ~~the~~ having pets in the workplace would cause more of a problem. The first problem being health. ~~So~~ A lot of people are allergic to animals and "some of these allergies are so severe that they cause rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks, and even severe respiratory disorders." (Text 2, lines 17-19) This could put an employees health at risk. Another reason

~~is that work stress there~~ is that ~~if~~ pets are not always clean. "Even potty-trained pets can have an accident now and then" (Text 1, lines 47-48). It does not look good to have a workplace with bad hygiene and low cleanliness. Also nobody wants to work in a place like that.

Overall there are pro's and con's about having pets in the workplace. But the pro's outweigh the con's and although pets might not be suitable for all workplaces, most workplaces should really consider becoming pet-friendly.

Anchor Level 4-B

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*I believe that pets should be allowed as they provide many benefits to humans*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*pets ... can influence conversations ... just like when you take your dog for a walk and you get more interactions from people around you and It would influence conversations at times that normally may be awkward*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*However some people would argue that having pets in the workplace would cause more of a problem. The first problem being health*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis ("*Shifting to a pet-friendly workplace can bring that same level of open and enthusiastic communication into the office*" and *A lot of people are allergic to animals. and "some of these allergies are so severe that they cause rashes, temporary breathlessness, panic attacks, and even severe respiratory disorders"*). The essay demonstrates proper citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [(Text 3, lines 34-35) and (Text 1, lines 47-48)]. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an introduction that presents the claim and a possible concern, followed by a paragraph presenting *reasons* why *pets should be allowed in the workplace*, then a paragraph presenting a counterclaim, and concluding with a summation. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style, using precise and appropriate language and structure (*This shows that there are multiple benefits to the employees if there are pets in the workplace and This would be good because you want the employees to interact and communicate while at work*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*the employee's, However some, employees health, hygiene, overall there, pro's and con's*) that do not hinder comprehension.

As of lately, the ~~work~~ workplace environment has been undergoing a major change concerning pets. Many offices are letting their workers bring pets into the building. This subject has become quite controversial because we are now questioning whether or not ~~the~~ ^{Pets} ~~are~~ ~~improving~~ improving conditions. Workplaces should not allow pets because there are too many health concerns to justify the benefits.

People first began bringing their pets to work because they believe that it is a strong stress reliever. ~~and~~ Pets can lower blood pressure and increase worker efficiency. However, what these people are not taking into account is what cons could result from pets. Allergies and phobias are quite common occurrences and can ~~even~~ ~~destroy~~ destroy some one's ability to work. " ... Americans with one form of pet allergy or another ~~are~~ [are] at 15% to 30% of the total population." (Text 2). The health risks that these factors bring in trump the previous notions of pets being a stress reliever. It just isn't safe to include animals as a common

office environment factor.

Another reason it is unsafe for pets to be in offices is that it could result in injuries to the workers. As we all may expect, not all animals are friendly 100% of the time. Often times dogs can become uncomfortable in an office which will lead to nervousness. If someone does not catch this they may frighten the dog and get bitten. "co-workers might interpret the panting of a dog as a friendly smile rather than a sign of nervousness. And in dogs, nervousness can lead to bites."

(Text 4). As well as the bad effects of an injury, a bite could also lead to quarrels between employees. The safety of workers just cannot be guaranteed with animals on the loose.

Similar to the topic of injuries is fights. In an office with a plural of pets there is the quite likely chance of two animals getting into scraps. Animals are uncivilized and cannot follow the standards set by humans. "The..." So there is the potential for fights between dogs and cats

brought to work.” (Text 2). Such fights are a major distraction to the workplace environment.

To sum up the issues, there are just too many health concerns to justify the pros of pets in the workforce. It may increase work efficiency but it isn't worth risking other people's skins. If such a topic as bringing your pet to work appears near you, it may be best to argue against it.

Anchor Level 4-C

The essay introduces a precise claim, as directed by the task (*Workplaces should not allow pets because there are too many health concerns to justify the benefits*). The essay demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts, as necessary to support the claim (*Allergies and phobias are quite common occurrences and can destroy some ones ability to work*) and to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Pets can lower blood pressure and increase worker efficiency. However, what these people are not taking into account is what cons could result from pets*). The essay presents ideas sufficiently, making adequate use of specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“...Americans with one form of pet allergy or another [are] at 15 % to 30 % of the total population” and “co-workers might interpret the panting of a dog as a friendly smile, rather than a sign of nervousness. And in dogs nervousness can lead to bites”). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes, identifying texts but failing to supply line numbers [(Text 2) and (Text 4)] and disregarding citations for paraphrased material. The essay exhibits acceptable organization of ideas and information to create a coherent essay, with an introduction that establishes a claim against pets in the workplace because of *health concerns*, followed by three paragraphs supporting the claim (*As we all may expect, not all animals are friendly 100% of the time and they may frighten the dog and get bitten*) followed by a summative conclusion that reaffirms the original claim (*To sum up the issues, there are just too many health concerns to justify the pros of pets in the workforce*). The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*In an office with a plural of pets there is the quite likely chance of two animals getting into scraps and it isn't worth risking other people's skins*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*becom, occurances, some ones, quorals, garanteed, distraction, efficiency but it*) that do not hinder comprehension.