

**Exemplar Papers
with
Annotations**

Purpose of Exemplar Set

The set of exemplar papers is made up of examples of student responses that represent each score point. Please note that “exemplar” refers to the fact that these student responses are good examples of particular scores, not necessarily ideal or exemplary work. Each exemplar paper has been previously scored and includes an annotation that provides an explanation about the rationale for scoring.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level _____ Date _____

Name of CBA _____

6th Period Lack of Recycling 9th Grade

Recycling is the biggest advancement in environmental health ever. People and nature alike have come together to reduce, reuse and recycle, and clean up the environment substantially, but lately, recycling efforts have decreased drastically. Stakeholders are not rare in this topic, in fact, every human on Earth is a stakeholder, but there are also many specific holders in this issue. From beverage companies, to environmental activists, recycling stakeholders have to pay attention to the recycling market, the inclines, declines etc. There are billion dollar businesses that have considerable amounts of money on whether or not they recycle, all the way to the average middle class family deciding if the extra money is worth the environmental impact. There are those that disagree with recycling, then there is the majority that make it a necessity, then there's those who don't care either way.

First of all, there's recycling, which is the processing of industrial and household waste, so that these materials can be reused, (Recycling). Many things can be recycled; among them are things like mixed paper, plastics, aluminum, and a few types of metal. Recycling has made enormous positive impacts on air pollution, waste management and more landfill space. Recycling has been making an upward spiral since the 60's, but has lately started to die down, and even decrease. Despite the great recycling efforts that have been made though, recycling has never reached its full potential, and is, in fact, losing its momentum. Basically, there is much more that can be done, that only small groups of people here and there are doing, (Boissen, Edward).



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

Out of the many stake holders, one stands out, mainly because there are so many sub-stakeholders to go with it. These stakeholders are beverage companies, major million dollar businesses selling merchandise worth a large fortune daily. Every one of these companies puts out millions, if not billions of aluminum cans a year. Aluminum can be recycled, and that makes for a lot of recycling. In 1999, 114 billion beverage containers were thrown away. If these cans had been recycled, they would have saved energy equivalent to 27.4 million barrels of oil, and decreased greenhouse gas emissions by 4.8 metric tons carbon equivalent. Along with this, beverage container recycling rates are dropping, and of the 192 billion pre-packaged beverages sold in 1999, 82 billion were thrown away, (Boissen, Edward).

One smaller, more specific stakeholder is BEARS, (Burnley Employment and Rehabilitation Services). BEARS provides jobs for physically disabled people. The employees help to take apart old and used computers so they can be recycled. With the increase in computer recycling, BEARS believes it will be able to make available more jobs. Even with the increase in computer recycling, there are still more and more computers being thrown away. A computer being thrown away presents a bigger dilemma than if paper or other materials were being thrown away. Computers take up more space in landfills and cost more money to get rid of in general. With the drastic price drops in new LCD monitors, old monitors are being thrown out daily, and this is a large negative influence on today's recycling. In fact, more than 45 million computers, and 500 million old televisions will be thrown away by the year 2005. BEARS has been recycling 1000 computer monitors a month since their program started. There are many other non-profit organizations where old computers can be sent to where they'll be recycled and refurbished. Also, many organizations like the Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, donate old, but working computers to different groups. The EPA itself donated over 800 computers to school districts lately, (Satkofsky, Amy).



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

One set of stakeholders in recycling are potential rural homeowners. If there is too much waste being piled up in rural regions, potential homeowners will have no land to build their homes. Landfills are taking over a lot of land. For example, in North Bend, Washington, there is a landfill that spreads out over almost a mile. The city is planning to build a park on top of it, (grass has grown over it all), but they have to wait first for the waste to decompose much more. Another stakeholder is hunters. Landfills spread waste through the wilderness. When hunters kill and eat the animals that live in these wildernesses, the animal could be sick, making the hunter himself sick.

The whole world and all of its population is a stakeholder, but none more than the United States. In an average lifetime, most Americans will throw away 600 times his or her body weight in garbage. With the growing average of weight that is America, that's about 90,000 pounds of waste per person, or about 4.4 pounds per day. Recycling is a problem for some people, but not because they don't want to recycle, but more because it's not worth the money. If America could recycle all its recyclable materials, we could decrease carbon dioxide discharges by more than 850 pounds per year. We could also build an entire fleet of commercial airplanes or supply Los Angeles with energy for almost ten years. Waste management has to be managed for so many reasons and it is not being done very actively, (www.obviously.com/recycle/guides/shortest.html).

There are many solutions that could be proposed for this issue, all dealing with different stakeholders. Referring back to beverage companies, where so many aluminum cans were and are being thrown away as opposed to recycled, solutions are not hard to find. If the beverage companies can make it more obvious on their products that they can, in fact, be recycled, this would trigger inside someone's head when they see it, and hopefully find the next recycling can. In the same issue, recycling companies themselves can do many things, like put out public service announcements, encourage the beverage companies to label their cans better etc.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

Secondly, there is the issue of computers being thrown away. This would be easy to solve if people would try to care about it. As was said earlier, there are numerous non-profit organizations and associations that their purpose is to take old and used computers and either take them apart for recycling, or donate them to other groups and schools. People can even personally take their computers and see if a local charity or school district has the need for it, and the individual could even take it apart himself for recycling. Every computer that is not wasted is a step forward.

Lastly, the most solutions lie in the issue of the American public. The issues surrounding recycling in America don't only revolve around not taking a pop can and throwing in a recycling can, it is more of an issue about laziness. The average American throws away 90, 000 pounds in their lifetime, that's a lot of pounds of garbage wasted, that could have been recycled. Granted, not everything can be recycled, but that number right there shows how much each person contributes to the downfall of our environment and the destruction of our habitats. If people just put forth the extra effort to throw their waste into the recycling rather than the garbage, we can make this Earth a much cleaner place.

Finally, recycling is a great success story in the United States and the world, but at the same time, it is falling like a one hit wonder. It has reached its peak and it is descending down the other side of the mountain. Recycling has dropped in almost every category of materials, locations (countries, states), and general rates. It does not have to keep dropping through, if people can once again come together to reduce, reuse and recycle, our environment, and our own personal health can drastically improve and we can look forward to a clean, spacious Earth.

EXEMPLAR #1 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 4

This response earns the score of 4 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of three or more of the stakeholders' uses of the environment. In its discussion of the disposal and recycling of various products, the response recognizes that some stakeholders' use of the environment has had negative consequences (beverage companies have created 114 billion beverage containers that were thrown away, Americans throw away 4.4 pounds of trash per day—in both cases, this disposal results in a waste of energy and land) and other stakeholders' use has had positive consequences ("BEARS recycles 1000 computer monitors each month"). The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of at least three stakeholders' uses of the environment earns the response four points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 4

This response earns the score of 4 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue with three reasons explicitly supported by accurate evidence. The response states that the solution to the disposal of waste is to continue the "upward spiral" of recycling. The response supports this solution by pointing out that increased recycling could save energy (equivalent to 27.4 million barrels of oil), provide computers to non-profits, and decrease carbon dioxide discharges in the United States. Proposing a solution that is backed by three reasons earns the response four points on this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it does not explicitly cite and restate information from specific sources. Although relevant statistics and information are provided, the specific sources for this information cannot be determined. While references are made to authors throughout the response, these references are not clear enough to be credited.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date 3/12/04

Name of CBA Humans and the Environment

Air pollution from burning gasoline in cars is a major concern today. It reduces air quality, causes health problems and destroys ozone. The stakeholders in this issue are the oil industry, car owners, car manufacturers, and anyone who lives in an area with many cars. There are potential solutions to this issue, including changing fuel in cars, reducing car use, making cars burn gas in a cleaner manner, using other forms of transportation and planting more plants. The government also plays a role in the form of making laws that minimize emissions by setting standards of cleanliness.

There are a few stakeholders in this issue. The oil industry is the source, but not the creator, of the pollution, as they mine and refine oil that is later burned as gasoline in cars. They require that people continue using cars and gasoline in their cars if they want to be successful. Car manufacturers continue the problem by using gasoline in cars, and sometimes not using proper cleaning devices in the cars. The car manufacturers can use cleaner fuel easily, and change fuels with only slight problems, but if people use other means of transportation or buy less cars, they will be negatively impacted. Car owners burn the gasoline and create the pollution. Car owners can use cars less, and use other forms of transportation. People that live in areas with many cars are usually also car owners, so they are causing pollution as well, but they, along with the environment, are the ones being negatively impacted by air pollution.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

The impact of pollution on the environment is very serious. The nitrogen oxide, volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates released by cars can cause many serious health problems in humans. They include sickness, eye and throat irritation, cancer, nerve damage, birth defects and long term effects on lungs and breathing passages (www.epa.gov/3 and www.doc.mmu.ac.uk/2). Air pollution is the cause of 1 in 10 lung cancer deaths and 24,000 deaths every year in the United Kingdom (www.resource-eef.com/1). Pollution also damages the environment. Acid rain and chemicals in the air harm plants and animals. They breathe in pollution as much as humans do. Air pollution damages the ozone, which will cause global warming and health problems due to radiation.

The government has passed a few laws to help reduce air pollution. The Clean Air Act, last amended in 1997, requires that cars have cleaner fuels, pollution control devices in cars work, and the amount of pollutants released into the air has a limit (www.epa.gov/3 and www.broward.org/4). The Energy Policy and Conservation Act, last amended in 1997, sets standards for fuel efficiency (www.broward.org/4).

Although changing fuel source in cars is the best and ultimate solution, there are a few steps that can be taken towards emitting no air pollution. Reducing car use will reduce pollution because it will reduce the amount of gas burned every day. Using other forms of transportation such as taking trains, will also reduce pollution in the same way as reducing car use. Making gas burn in a cleaner will reduce the amount of pollution released from



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– Continued –

every gallon of gas burned. Planting more plants will reduce pollution because plants take in some parts of pollution and leave clean air.

If the stakeholders don't use any of the possible solutions soon enough, pollution could destroy our environment and people's lives. It is a major problem, and instead of every one believing that it is some one else's responsibility, we all need to contribute to eliminate pollution.

Bibliography

- 1. www.resource-eef.com/n9polimphth.htm*
- 2. www.doc.mmu.ac.uk/aric/en/air-quality/older/cars.html*
- 3. www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/reg-caq/pegcaq01.html#topic1*
- 4. www.broward.org/airtips.htm*

EXEMPLAR #2 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 4

This response earns the score of 4 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of three or more of the stakeholders' uses of the environment. In its discussion of air pollution, the response recognizes at least three stakeholders (the oil industry, car manufacturers, and car owners), as well as the negative consequences to the environment that they are responsible for given the part each plays in creating air pollution (the air pollution causes increased illness such as lung cancer as well as acid rain). The response also recognizes that the government has tried to control air pollution through the passage of various acts, but the response does not explain how these acts have had consequences for the environment. The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of at least three stakeholders' uses of the environment earns the response four points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue that describes how the health of the system will be improved but does not provide support for that solution. The response states various ways in which air pollution could be reduced, but does not provide reasons to support these proposed solutions. Without providing support for its proposed solution(s), no more than one point can be earned for this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 4

The response earns the score of 4 on the Sources rubric because it accurately interprets relevant information from three specific sources. The response paraphrases relevant information found on three specific web sites (www.epa.gov, www.resource-eef.com, www.broward.org) within the context of its discussion. Interpreting information from at least three specific sources earns the response four points on this rubric.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level _____ Date 3-27-04

Name of CBA _____

When sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide combine they form an acidic compound, acid rain. Acid rain is caused by air pollution. Acid rain releases the aluminum in the soil, without the aluminum in the soil the plants can't get the nutrients they need to survive. The stakeholders are the companies that are burning the fossil fuels. Another stakeholder is the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). The government is also a stakeholder; they are passing the laws to limit acid rain. To lessen acid rain, people should reduce air pollution.

To understand the problem with acid rain, people should know the background information. Angus Smith was a British chemist who came up with the term acid rain in 1872. Acid rain is a very important environmental issue that has been increasing ever since the beginning of the industrial period. Even unpolluted hail, rain and snow are acidic; they just don't have enough to damage anything. In the United States eleven thousand lakes are one hundred percent acidic. In Canada, fourteen thousand lakes are 100 percent acidic and one hundred fifty thousand lakes are contaminated." We hope that the Northeast will finally see improved air quality with reduced urban smog, acid rain, and respiratory disease." Said Spitzer, Democrat. In the eastern lakes the recovery from the acid rain has been slower than expected although it is not looked at as a negative. "We may just have to wait longer to see recovery," said Stoddard.

While acid rain affects the water and aquatic life forms it also affects the trees. When acid rain takes out the Aluminum in the soil, it gives the trees a calcium deficiency. An acid rain-induced calcium deficiency makes trees more susceptible to death during the winter. Along with sulfur dioxide, coal and petroleum combined release harmful gases that cause acid rain. The harmful gases that cause acid rain kill animals, more specifically aquatic life forms." The effects of acid rain are incipient and so is the level of concern about it." Said Markewitz. In the mid 80's 23 million tons of sulfur dioxide was being pumped in America. There



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

is a lot of acid rain occurring in Europe. Half of Canada's pollution is coming from the United States causing acid rain. Ninety percent of acid rain is falling over Sweden majority is coming from Poland. Acid rain is affecting the entire world; all of the countries are suffering from the effects.

One of the stakeholders for acid rain is the companies that are burning fossil fuels and putting off air pollution. The companies that are burning fossil fuels are being asked by the EPA to install a piece of equipment that has a scrubber on it. The scrubber catches the sulfur dioxide in the smoke stacks. Predicted costs in 1998 to limit acid rain were around ten billion dollars, now the costs have been downsized to one billion dollars, the amount of sulfur dioxide being let off is down also. Now, the producers of air pollution are switching to low-sulfur coal in their smoke stacks, which is helping the reduction in acid rain." It was a radically different way to go about environmental regulation." Said economist, Denny Ellerman. These businesses don't have much of a say in this issue they are required to follow the laws that are set, which would be a good reason to set more laws.

Another stakeholder is the EPA; they are driven to prevent awareness about acid rain. The EPA is the Environmental Protection Agency they are committed to teaching people of the environmental issues that are in the world today, one of their big topics is acid rain. The EPA is trying to make laws that limit the amount of harmful gases that businesses can burn. The EPA says, "The overall goal of the Acid Rain Program is to achieve significant environmental and public health benefits through reductions in emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), the primary causes of acid rain. To achieve this goal at the lowest cost to society, the program employs both traditional and innovative, market-based approaches for controlling air pollution. In addition, the program encourages energy efficiency and pollution prevention." They are also notifying plants that they need to clean up their smoke stacks and pipes and they need to install the equipment that filters the Sulfur Dioxide. The EPA is an important group; it influences a lot of people to go their way on issues. The EPA is an important



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

stakeholder; they know a lot about acid rain and are fighting hard to prevent acid rain.

The government is a big stakeholder, not just the American government but also all of the countries governments. The governments have to decide the budgets for how much money they are going to allow to go to the improvement of the environmental problems. The taxpayers are the ones who have to pay for the environmental solutions. Taxes play a big part in the controversy due to the energy policy in 2001 there was a big increase for the taxpayer. They also have to decide which laws to pass for the filtering and amount of sulfur dioxide being let off. In the 90's Bush revealed the Clean Air Act amendment. It was a trading system intended to lessen the amount of sulfur dioxide being let off. A lot of environmental laws such as pollution, recycling, etc. were passed in the 90's. Countries like Japan, United States and Germany that are wealthy have a responsibility to set the standards as in what to do with the problem of acid rain. Japan was once one of the world's worst countries for helping the environment, now it is being recognized for being one of the more "greener" countries. Japan has played a big part in decreasing acid rain. The government has been researching and putting time into the prevention. Japans government started to change when the Montreal Protocol was formed. Sweden has actually worsened the problem for their country. The increase in use of electricity has caused the switch over to coal powered energy. The coal-powered energy has increased the air pollution. Germany's environmental approach is proven dominant; they believe the government can overrule the market if it's for the better of the people. It hasn't always been like that, when the first warnings of acid rain came out, Germany basically didn't care. So at first the governments were lacking initiative to set a model for the other countries, but now they are good standards to the acid rain difficulty.

There are many solutions being proposed, one solution is to pour limestone into the lakes. Activists say this is "expensive and impractical". Another solution is that the companies put in the filters for sulfur dioxide in their smoke stacks and pipes. Also the EPA has suggested to set laws for the amount of sulfur dioxide



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

being emitted. Scientists are analyzing a possible solution called the “hydrogen ion budget” meant for the Calhoun forest. The Hydrogen ions from acid replace the natural elements like aluminum in the soil. The other solution that is in effect right now is the Clear Skies act. Reductions from acid rain began after the clean air act was passed. It will help the ecosystems suffering from acid rain; it has also let some lakes and forests begin recovering. The clear skies act would speed up the recovery process in the Northeastern lakes. So since there are many proposals all of them should go into effect and help reduce acid rain and make a better environment.

In the future, laws should be strictly set for amounts of emissions for sulfur dioxide. There should be random check ups on companies to make sure that all the laws are being abided by. Certain people according to importance should have higher rank in how highly their ideas are considered. More environmentally safe products should be made and used.

A lot of stakeholders get their say in how to reduce a problem seeing as they are the ones most effected by it. Many stakeholders have many different proposals on how to handle acid rain. A lot of these proposals are rational and practical. To make things simpler, acid rain can be reduced if air pollution is reduced. To reduce air pollution everybody needs to follow the rules and laws set by the governments and protection agencies and also buy environmentally safe products.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– *Continued* –

Works Cited

“Acid Rain.” 1 Dec. 2003. Britannica Elementary. 22 Mar. 2004

<<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source was useful because it explained the causes and effects of acid rain.

It explained how acid rain is formed in a simple way that I could understand.

Cristol, Hope. “New Concern about Acid Rain.” The Futurist 1 Nov. 2002. 23 Mar. 2004

<<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This site helped me because it had quotes from people expressing

their concern. The quotes helped explain the point of views for the different stakeholders.

Cultip, Kimbra. “Deadly Rain.” Weatherwise 1 Sept. 2002. 24 Mar. 2004

<<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source explained the effects acid rain. It explained how it was effecting different places, it gave specific examples.

Earth Explorers. 23 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source gave me the background information. It explained the origin of the name and the scientist that discovered it.

Easterbrook, Gregg. “Bush,pollution, and hysteria.” The New Republic 1

July 2002. 20 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source gave simple facts and statistics. It gave the years that acid rain was a big issue and what the scientists did about it.

Fosgate, Helen. “Acid Rain threatens productivity.” Journal of Forestry 1

June 1999. 24 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source also gave statistics and facts about years and what scientists are doing now as far as research. It helped me explain the changes over the years in research.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– *Continued* –

Kerr, Richard A. “Acid Rain Control: Success on the Cheap.” Scholarly Journal 6 Feb. 1998. 17 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source helped me with the explaining the costs. It said the costs that the government was paying to reduce acid rain, and it also said how much money that is going in to repairing the lakes that have been damaged

Lofstedt, Ragnar E. “Playing politics with energy policy.” Environment 1 May 2001. 24 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source explained explained Sweden’s point of view. It helped me explain that acid rain isn’t just a problem in the United States but it is a problem internationally.

Roberts, Leslie. “Acid rain: forgotten, not gone.” Us News & World Report 1 Nov. 1999. 24 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source talked about the tree aspect of the problem. It helped me explain that it is damaging the ecosystem.

Schreurs, Miranda A. “Divergent Paths.” Scholarly Journal 1 Oct. 2003. 23 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source helped me alot. It explained the international governments plans and point of view on limiting acid rain.

Whitman, Christine T. Clear Skies Act. Table One, 8 Apr. 2003. 24 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.elibrary.com>>.

This source talked about the Clear Skies act. It helped me understand the plan that President Bush has for the environment.

Winkler, Robert. Is Acid Rain Killing Off Wood Thrushes. 13 Aug. 2002. 24 Mar. 2004 <<http://www.nationalgeographic.com>>.

This source helped me explain the effect it is having the animals in the environment.

EXEMPLAR #3 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 2

This response earns the score of 2 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment. In its discussion of acid rain, the response discusses the negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment (companies burning fossil fuels have caused more acid rain and lakes are becoming more acidic all over the world). The response also discusses other stakeholders (the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and governments from nations around the world), but does not discuss these stakeholders' uses of the environment or the consequences of these uses. The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment earns the response two points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue that describes how the health of the system will be improved but does not provide support for that solution. Without providing support for the proposed solution(s), no more than one point can be earned for this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 2

The response earns the score of 2 on the Sources rubric because it accurately interprets relevant information from one specific source. The response uses an acceptable quote from the EPA within the context of its discussion. Other references to sources and use of quotes are not sufficiently cited within the text to be credited (i.e., the sources for these quotes are unclear). Interpreting information from this specific source earns the response two points on this rubric.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date 3/12/04

Name of CBA Humans & the Environment

Since 1990 Meth lab production has increased heavily. Meth labs are beniffical to the sellers & makers of Meth & also to the makers of the products which are used to make it. But that is not even close to being a good reason. There are so many down sides to meth. For instance, the makers of meth cause problems for the people who live there or who will live there, because when you cook meth the harmful & fatal fumes that mix together stay in the dry wall, wood, and insulation, causing the people to breath it in, and making all kinds of respritory & lung diseses & cancer.

Not to mention all the costs & higher taxes the public has to pay on clean up, law enforcement, land for meth land fills,



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

owner's houses, the list just goes on & on. But law enforcement has gone over many obstacles to crack down on meth. No pun intended. But seriously folks, meth users and makers also bring children into this because a lot of the people doing this stuff are doing it to get by but they have their children in the house or wherever they're doing this at. Meth makers also harm the environment by throwing bad batches on the ground or in water causing the water to be contaminated for humans, fish, plants, animals, and any other aquatic species.

I propose that we take and make more reliable neighborhood watch systems, and just have everybody aware of that drug activity looks & smells like. If we can do this taxes could possibly lower. But if this is accomplished



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

the environment can be restored because
there will just a little bit cleaner air. I wont
be that cleaner but if you drop a penny in
a bucket over time it'll build up.

EXEMPLAR #4 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 2

This response earns the score of 2 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment. In its discussion of illegal methamphetamine production, the response discusses the negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment (makers of illegal methamphetamine contaminate the water and contribute to respiratory disease through the production of harmful fumes). The response also discusses other stakeholders (taxpayers and the community), but does not discuss these stakeholders' uses of the environment or the consequences of these uses. The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment earns the response two points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue that describes how the health of the system will be improved but does not provide support for that solution. Without providing support for the proposed solution(s), no more than one point can be earned for this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it uses only anecdotal information to support its ideas and claims. Although relevant statistics and information are provided throughout the essay, they are not specifically cited and there is no evidence of specific sources being used.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date 3/12/04

Name of CBA Humans and The Environment

The issue that I am planning to discuss is the question: Are logging practices seriously hurting our forests? Mainly the old growth forests in the United States. Only 3% of the entire nations forests are old growth. That is 4.3 million acres of old growth remain and they are only in patches. Most are protected in National forests, but some are still being logged today. There are people who are fighting for both sides of this issue. The two main opposing stakeholders are the logging companies who are cutting down these trees to make livings, and the environmentalists who believe reducing the amount old growth timber cut down will keep the beauty of our forests alive. Can this issue be solved? Is there a balance between these two sides? Understanding both sides in more depth will help us figure this out.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

The role of the environmentalists is to prevent our old growth forests in the U.S. from being cut down. An old growth forest is a forest with fallen trees, moss, tall trees with multiple layered canopies, and dense vegetation. These forests are usually older than 400 years. The environmentalists believe logging companies are not practicing sustainable forestry, which is keeping enough timber in the world so we won't run out. Environmentalists don't think it is necessary to cut down old growths if they are replanting what they cut down. Because timber companies do cut old growth environmentalists don't believe they are cutting properly. These people have proposed that timber cutting be reduced. In 2001, they attempted to reduce the amount of wood put up for auction by 50 percent. The problem with this is, the fact that not enough wood will be produced for the public each year.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

These people also say that old growth timber is as important to wildlife and growth when it is dead on the ground, as it is when it is alive.

Destroying an old growth forest can damage or destroy the wildlife living on the ground as well as the trees. Once again this solution doesn't erase the fact that less timber will be cut.

150,000-250,000 acres of timber are cut each year. This is a lot of wood and cannot be harvested through just second growth timber.

The things that the environmentalists are doing to support their cause is keeping old growths in National parks and passing laws to make it very difficult for logging companies to cut in National forests. These laws include the

"Endangered Species Act," and the "National Environmental Protection Act." Along with

"hugging" trees, these people are voicing their opinions seriously.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

The other stakeholder in this issue are the Logging companies. These people cut down the trees not because they are against the environmentalists, but because they need to make a living and support themselves. They cut down trees because the demand for lumber is very high. They believe they are producing lumber for humans so I can write on this paper; but the problem is, our forests get lost quicker. They use a method of planting what you take. When the clear-cut, they replant the forest. People argue this doesn't not produce would fast enough to grow enough quality lumber. These companies must then turn to our old growth resources. Most timber that is logged is private and only 10% or less of forests logged is National or Old growth. The companies have Regulations to log different forests. It is not just wild slashing that these people are



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

doing. The other things these companies do is give 25% of their revenues to schools and roads. No matter how much old growth or new growth is taken, it is all produced into furniture and goods for us Americans.

My solution is simple. I think we continue to cut down the current amount of trees we are logging. This many mean destroying some old growths, but it needs to happen. There are still some Old growth forests that will be protected always. The trees are being replanted and are keeping the timber companies caught up. One other thing that we could do to improve this situation is to make use of the 29.6 million tons of wood that are recovered each year in waste. Recycling these would help. This is 15 times the amount of annually cut timber from National forests. If we could make use of these disposed lumber products, our problem of

EXEMPLAR #5 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 2

This response earns the score of 2 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment. In its discussion of the American logging industry, the response discusses the positive consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment (logging companies' cutting down of trees provides revenue for schools and roads and provides furniture and goods for Americans). The response also discusses other stakeholders (environmentalists), but does not discuss these stakeholders' uses of the environment or the consequences of these uses. Instead, the response only discusses the potential consequences if some environmentalists proposed measures were adopted (e.g., in 2001 they attempted to reduce the amount of wood put up for auction by 50 percent). The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder's use of the environment earns the response two points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 2

This response earns the score of 2 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue with one reason explicitly supported by accurate evidence. The response proposes a solution to continue the current level of old growth cutting but to counter the negative effects of this cutting with replanting and recycling. The response supports this solution by pointing out that increased recycling could save 15 times the amount of annually cut timber from National Forests. The response earns two points for proposing a solution that is fair to both stakeholders and is backed by one reason.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it uses only anecdotal information to support its ideas and claims. Although relevant statistics and information are provided throughout the essay, they are not specifically cited and there is no evidence of specific sources being used.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level _____ Date _____

Name of CBA _____

The Makah Indian Whale Hunt issue

Since the 1920's, the Makah Whale Hunt Tribe has been a big issue. The Makah's have cultural and important reasons to hunt whales. However, activists have been taking action against them in court and out of court. Animal rights groups have been protesting against them because of what they say is animal cruelty and not wanting to risk the gray whales to go back to the endangered species list. The Makah Indian Tribe should be able to hunt for religious reasons and the treaty right.

The Environmental problem started back in the 1920's, when the gray whale population was 2,000. The gray whales were being extinct from centuries of Commercial whales close to extinction which caused the whaling ban that began in 1927 according to the source Williamson. So, the Makah Indian Whale hunt tribe could not continue their traditions. But again in 1994, the gray whale was taken off the endangered species list, and now there is about 20,000 gray whale that migrate from Alaska to Mexico each year during spring, according to the source Seinfeld, Keith from "All things considered". Anti-whaling organizations are concerned that if the Makah Indian tribe continue their traditional hunt then the gray whale will be put back into the endangered species list. They are also against the torture and suffering of the gray whales from what the Makah tribe is doing to them because of their culture.

Two of the stake holders are the Makah Indian tribe and the animal right's groups. The Makah Indian tribe has religious reasons for having to hunt. They have been hunting gray whales for as long as 4,000 years. Whaling meant the spiritual and technological preparedness of the Makah people and wealth of their culture, a whaling team includes one or more canoes, one chase boat, and one or more support boats. They would prepare for weeks just to hunt for a gray whale. Every person in the 8 people group would have a job to do before the attack like



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– *Continued* –

one prepared to shoot the whale, one on the boat, one or more people that sew the mouth of the whale and so on, According to source, "The official website of the Makah tribe". Whale meat made-up 80% of their diet, which now they have had to buy normal artificial food from the grocery store. That has resulted in heart diseases, diabetes, and cancer because of the food and the drastic change of diet that they had been use to for years. Something that never occurred, that had to do with that kind of food. Historically, oil that came from gray whale blubber was economically the most important for them. Whales are a powerful symbol because of it being the largest mammal on earth. They also used the bones to make tools out of them, according to the source "Foundation for National progress" .After a whale is hunted and taken to the village, the native people will greet the success of the hunters with a song and a celebration. That is what it took to be a whaler and what it meant to be a whaler in their culture, according to source Seinfeld, Keith from "All things considered" that would bring the native tribe together and enrich their culture as well . The Makah Native Tribe signed an agreement between the Makah Tribe and the government, Isaac Stevens, In Neah Bay that also gave them the right to hunt whales. A lot of people are with the Makah tribe if they understand and know their culture but if not then their anti- whaling people and animals right's groups. The Makah's have lost a lot of money, from not being able to hunt anymore, and it has affected their economy. The Anti-whaling and animal right's group's have been against the Makah culture all along. They have been trying to do their work, by taking them to work and trying to get people on their side. They have been accusing them of animal cruelty and risking whales to be back in the endangered species list, making the gray whale population as low as 2,500 world wide but has increased by 2.5% in the last 70 years according to source, Brosman, Deborah from "Sustainable Ecosystems Institute ". The animal rights groups have responded to this problem by suing the Federal National Marine Fisheries service for letting the Makahs hunt for 5 years with a maximum of 5 whales per year and breaking the Marine Mammal Protection Act that was made in 1972 according to the source, Shunovosky,Paul from "Court stops Makah Whale Hunt".The Makah's have responded by asking the International Whaling



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

Commission permission to hunt under some conditions like a reasonable number of whales per year for 5 years, before the Animals Rights groups took them to court. The Makah's also reminded the Federal Court about the treaty in 1855, the trade of land for whale hunting as a guaranteed agreement. The government and Federal Court accepted that but anti-whaling people took action by actively using watercrafts to interfere with their hunt on their first day of hunt in 70 years, according to source Baker, James. International Whaling Commission. The Makahs couldn't take them to court because they did not have any money to fight the Anti-whaling battles of the animal rights groups like Sea-Shepherd and P.A.W.S. The final decision was made on December.25, 2002, when the three Judge Panel of the 9th Circuit court announced that the Makah tribe could not continue hunting because it violated the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act made in 1972. It ignored the 1855 treaty, according to the source, "Turtle Island Native Network".

A solution would be to stop whale hunting. But what if so? Yes the activists would win this trial but what about the tribal ancient culture? It would really effect them since it's a tradition that they have done for thousands of years. It would show that a environmental problem that use to be one is more important then traditions and the treaty right of 1855. The other solution would be to let the Makah Indian tribe hunt under some conditions.

Maybe under some conditions that would not effect the gray whale population greatly, like 5 whales a year for a couple of decades and record the results to see if its affecting the gray whale population. Based on the results the Federal Court can decide for how many more years the tribe can hunt. The proper solution would be to give the Makah tribe a chance to hunt whales. Five whales per year and for 5 years would be a reasonable amount of whales to hunt per year. Then see upon the results of the gray whale population, if they should hunt for more years or for a specific number of years. The population of gray whales is more then 24,000 world wide according to source,(Seinfeld,Kieth. "All things Considered").It would not hurt just to hunt a maximum of 5 whales per year for 5 years at least. It would be a win-win solution because activists would let the Makah whale hunt tribe be able to



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— *Continued* —

continue their traditions but under some regulations. Trying to make it fair for both sides is the best. It would not necessarily be breaking the Act against the Marine Mammal Protection since that act was made in 1972 after the treaty. The treaty was made way back in 1855, It would be ignoring that treaty if permission was not given to the Makah's to hunt under some conditions or rules. If permission was not given to hunt, it would be ignoring the 1855 treaty. The Makah Tribe would have a right to gain their 3,000 acre property in the U.S.A. back, according to source, "The Official Website of the Makah tribe". The Native Americans are the aboriginal people of the U.S, so they should have the right to do so anyway especially if they signed a treaty.

The Makah Indian tribe should be able to hunt for treaty rights and for religious reasons. They grew up with traditions and it wouldn't be right to change them. They should have freedom just like anyone else. This isn't an end, it will continue until the Makah Indian Tribe has justice in their hands. The government should know the Makah's traditions and more because maybe he will understand where they are coming from. It's all about understanding where they come from and the inherence and what it means to them. They need to put themselves in their shoes.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– Continued –

Bibliography

- 1) History, Whaleing.Jan.2003.The Official Website to the Makah tribe. 24 Mar 2004.
www.Makah.com. I thought this website was a good resource because it pointed out important stuff. It told you what it this issue was mainly about.

- 2) Makah updated 2002.Turtle Island Native Network.24 Mar 2004.
<http://www.turtleisland.org/news-Makah.htm>
I thought that this was resourceful because it told you told you about the environmental problem specifically and it was updated.

- 3) Makah Management Plan for Makah treaty gray whale.
April 8, 2001.Northwest Indian Fisheries
commission.24 Mar 2004. **<http://www.NorthwestIndianCommission.org/edu>**
I thought it was resourceful because it talk about it in the point of view from the makah because their the ones that constructed this website.

- 4) Michael, Satchell. “A whale of protest”.U.S news & world report.
10-05-1998. ProQuest.24.Mar 2004.
This was resourceful because it talked about it from when it started until what is being done about it.

- 5) Shunkovsky, Paul. “Court stops Makah Whale Hunt”.
Seattle Port-Intelligencer Reporter.21 Dec 2002.24 Mar 2004.
<http://Seattlepi.nwsourc.com/local/101002-Makah21>.
It was resourceful because it gave me information about why makah is legal or why it should be legal.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– *Continued* –

6) Serving the treaty Indian Tribes in Western Washington. Aug.1998.Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. <http://www.hwifc.WA.gov/>

This resource was good because it talks about people being against it or with the makahs. They talk about their opinion's and facts.

7) Whaling Commission discusses lifting ban .April 1999.Foundation for National progress.24 Mar.2004. <http://www.DailyNews.org/edu>

I thought this was an alright resourceful because it talks about stuff that is old and already said enough.

8) Whaling and the Makah Indians .Aug 1998.Stony Brook State University of New York.23 Mar

2004. <http://www.ic.sunysb.edu/stu/hglasgow/WEBwhale.htm>.

It was a good resource because it both views of the activists and the Makahs , what they had to say about it.

9) Baker, James. "Whaling Commission". International whaling commission.17 May.ProQuest.24 Mar 2004

It was a good resource because it talks about activists and what they have been doing about this situation lately.

10) Williamson, Mike. "Why Indians must hunt the gray whale" U.S new's online.26 Spet.1998.Mar 22, 2004. <http://Whale.Wheelock.edu>

It was a good resource because it helped me get things together.

11) Brosman, Deborah "Sustainable Ecosystems Institute". Facts and Events about the Makah hunt and killing .17 May 1999.

http://www.sei.org/makah_hunt_facts.html

It was a good resource because it talked about the problem and how it can be solved.

12) Seinfeld, Keith and Daniel Zwerding. "Whales"Weekend All things Considered.09-27-1998.ProQuest.22 Mar.2004.

EXEMPLAR #6 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 3

This response earns the score of 3 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of two of the stakeholders' uses of the environment. In its discussion of the Makah Whale Hunt, the response recognizes the benefit it has had on the Makah tribe prior to the restrictions from the court (they maintain tribal traditions, keep their treaty rights, and benefit financially and physically from hunting the whales). The response also discusses the successful efforts of animal rights groups to protect the whales as another stakeholder's use of the environment. In addition, the response explains how the court restrictions placed on the whale hunt as a result of the efforts of animal rights groups had negative consequences for members of the Makah tribe (loss of money, increased disease rates due to the need to eat "artificial food" instead of whale meat). The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of at least two stakeholders' uses of the environment earns the response three points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 3

This response earns the score of 3 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue with two reasons explicitly supported by accurate evidence. The response proposes that a solution can be reached between the Makah and the animal rights group by adopting a limit of a very small number (five whales for five years) of whales that the Makah could hunt, which is supported by the idea that that would allow the Makah to uphold their treaty rights to hunt while also largely adhering to the 1972 Marine Mammal Protection Act that the animal rights groups were supporting. The response earns three points for proposing a solution that is fair to both stakeholders and is backed by two reasons.

Sources Rubric

Score: 4

The response earns the score of 4 on the Sources rubric because it accurately interprets relevant information from three specific sources. The response uses information found on both the radio (NPR's "All Things Considered") and the Internet (both the Makah's tribal web site and the Turtle Island Native network) within the context of its discussion. Interpreting information from at least three specific sources earns the response four points on this rubric.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date March 12, 2004

Name of CBA Humans and the Environment

According to an article entitled Overpopulation, "It took all of recorded history until 1830 for world population to reach one billion; by 1930 we were at two billion . . . and in 1949 we crossed the six billion mark." Our world is currently growing by 78 million people per year. The fast abundance of people has caused problems all over our planet: deforestation, topsoil erosion, inadequate farming, desertification, air pollution, water pollution, and even global warming. However, an article in SIRS entitled Population Implosion suggested that the real problem is that there is an "inequitable distribution of the world's food and essential resources." This point can be proved by the fact that the U.S accounts for 6% of the world's population, but consumes 30% of its resources. and all the while 790 million people go to bed hungry each night.

The problems our world is facing can be looked at from many points of view. First there are the governments. In 1994, government officials from 179 different countries got together in



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

Cairo for the International Conference on Population and Development. There they put together a 20 year Program of Action to help reduce the world's population. Obviously these men believe Earth to be overpopulated and would like it to reduce. On the other hand we have worldwide businesses that believe that the more people there are, the more money they'll make. Also, in countries like France, Italy, and Japan, they can't afford for their population to go down. The economy would crumble. Next is China with its one child policy, and India which pays parents for having only 1 or two kids. And lastly we have the U.S., who believes all parents should have a choice on how big their family is. However, the U.S. does provide a family planning program to other countries to help families who do and don't want children. Obviously, there are many different stakeholders in this serious problem. But just how serious is it?

Our planet suffers more and more every year because of the amount of people on our plant. First is the problem of our disappearing rain forests. Over the past 50 years, our world



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

has lost 80% of its natural forests. In countries like India, Brazil, and Congo, which possess a combined 80% of the world's remaining rain forests, the wood from the forests is the people's main source of energy, so the governments of these countries have not come up with a conservation plan. Also, because overcultivation of our earth has degraded around 2 billion hectares of farmable land, rainforests are being cleared for more farming space. This brings a new problem: topsoil erosion.

A good example of the problems of deforestation was seen in Nepal. Farmers cut down trees on the Himalayan slopes so they could have more farmland. However, monsoon season came, and Nepal's number one export, its topsoil, got washed away in four different rivers, where it settled in India. This abundance of soil caused devastating floods in India, especially Bangladesh.

Because all things are tied together somehow, this problem must cause another: desertification. When trees are cut down and the topsoil is washed away, the ruthless sun bleaches the



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

land and makes it virtually uninhabitable. A good example is Africa, where the desert is growing by 6 miles each year. Unfortunately, Africa is the world's fastest growing country, population-wise, that is. This is why Africa & countries like it are so poor: the land is bad, but the country keeps on growing to the point where there's more people than food.

Another problem of overpopulation is air/water pollution. Everyone's heard of global warming, but is it real? Statistics show that in the past 15 years, our earth has had 14 of the warmest years in recorded history. Also, science has proven that the ozone layer over the Antarctic is decaying. Cars and cities burning billions of gallons of fossil fuels each year account for the majority of the pollution. When these dangerous gases get into the air, they eat at the ozone layer and also cause acid rain, which pollutes our rivers and limited fresh water supply.

So, Earth has all these problems, and what can be done? The first thing is awareness. People all over the world need to know what the problem is. Countries like Brazil, Indonesia,



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

and Congo need to come up with a rainforest conservation plan to save the rainforest. Wealthier countries need to help bring energy and resources to these countries so they don't have to rely on valuable wood to heat their homes. Also, children have to be wanted, not accidental. One goal of the International Conference on Population and Development was, "Every child, a wanted child." The world needs more conferences like the ICPD. Countries need to communicate and world leaders must take action. If they don't, we'll leave the world in much worse shape than we found it, creating a dark future for the generations to come. It's our world right now, and we need to leave it in better shape than we found it. It's hard, but possible, if we take action NOW!

EXEMPLAR #7 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 4

This response earns the score of 4 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of three or more of the stakeholders' uses of the environment. In its discussion of the world's growing population, the response recognizes that the use of the environment by several countries' populations has had negative consequences (overcultivation in India, Brazil, and the Congo has led to the loss of farmable land, deforestation in Nepal led to the loss of topsoil, desertification in Africa). While these countries are not explicitly described as stakeholders, the discussion of the negative consequences of their populations' uses of the environment is sufficiently clear to be credited. The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of at least three stakeholders' uses of the environment earns the response four points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue that describes how the health of the system will be improved but does not provide support for that solution. The response proposes several solutions to overpopulation, such as the idea suggested by the ICPD that every child born should be wanted: "Every child, a wanted child." The International Conference on Population and Development's suggestion to curb unwanted births is a reasonable solution to the problem of overpopulation. However, the response does not include any evidence-based reasons to support this position. Without providing support for the proposed solution(s), no more than one point can be earned for this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 3

The response earns the score of 3 on the Sources rubric because it accurately interprets relevant information from two specific sources. The response uses information found in two periodicals (the article entitled "Overpopulation" and an article in SIRS named "Population Implosion") within the context of its discussion. Interpreting information from two specific sources earns the response three points on this rubric.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date 03-12-04

Name of CBA Humans & the Environment

The issue I have concluded to choose is the topic of fish and hydroelectric dams. Throughout the years many of the fish that are sacred to many are dying at a constant rate. What was once said to be considered in abundance before white man inhabited America, is now currently found on the endangered species list. Over the ages the salmon have been dying off in numerous amounts but not just by its natural predators such as the eagles, bears, otters, and the occasional fishers, but by hydroelectric dams. Salmon, who every season swim upstream and spawn are faced with the enormous pressure of the dams of about 30 to



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

50 mph being pulled into the turbines built at the bottom of the dams. This is where nearly all salmon don't make it, only the few who made it through without being chopped to pieces are faced with another predator. At the other end of the dam perched on rocks are thousands of seagulls waiting for the bruised and weak to come. Rarely do the salmon have a chance to make it out. People that have battled for fishs' rights are the enviromentalists along with the Native Americans who live along the Columbia River and other neighboring rivers. This issue was even brought all the way to the President and his officials. Ang to bring it up there has never been a positive solution to the affair.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

All the hydroelectric dams' representatives was do to occurring issue was to say "we're working on it." But all that they brought was the idea of putting a screen on the turbines to prevent the salmon from going in. But when you analyze the solution there is over a 1,000 pounds of pressure being put on them, how can they get out? Many ideas have been tossed around but one seems to outstand, in which is the solution that I propose. What hydroelectric dams should do is to create 'spills' over dams, so to allow fish to at least make it over safely. But then again there is a negative to every solution. Some of the water that is spilled would what hydroelectric dams say is



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

– Continued –

"wasted". Look around there is also solar energy, biochemical, and nuclear energy for every one to use.

EXEMPLAR #8 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 2

This response earns the score of 2 on the Stakeholder rubric for providing accurate analysis of the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of one of the stakeholder’s uses of the environment. In its discussion of the building of hydroelectric dams, the response recognizes that the building of those dams proves to be a financial boon to the dam’s owners, regardless of any environmental squabbles they may produce. The response also describes how the dams have resulted in negative consequences for the environment (the reduction of the salmon population). Although a number of other stakeholders may be mentioned—animal rights groups, Native Americans—their uses of the environment are not sufficiently discussed to be credited. The accurate analysis of the benefits and/or negative consequences of one stakeholder’s use of the environment earns the response two points on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue but providing little or no support for that solution. Although the response proposes that a solution to the environmental troubles that dams cause could be the creation of “spills” over the dams, which would allow some fish to survive, the solution is not supported with any specific details. Without supporting the solution, no more than one point can be earned on this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it uses only anecdotal information to support its ideas and claims. Although relevant statistics and information are provided throughout the essay, they are not specifically cited and there is no evidence of specific sources being used.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 10 Date 3-12-04

Name of CBA Loggers vs. Environmentalists

Loggers around the world are being told they can not cut down trees any longer. If we make all loggers stop cutting then, we will no longer have many of the necessary products we have now. For example; cut no more and then we will have a deadening supply of paper, pencils, books, homes and many other wooden products, you might be able to think of.

Environmentalists try to say that loggers are taking more than their fair share of trees from our forests. Environmentalists say if loggers and them can come up with a list of agreeing rules and regulations then, mabe loggers can cut without the damage being caused to the forests.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

Rules are as follows: After cutting large sums of trees. They (loggers) are required to replant new trees in that area, within three years. And have healthy new supply of trees. Then they should also be designated an area just to cut and replant over and over. Also they should use trees that are infected or have damages. They may also use fallen or left behind trees from the forest floors. Rather than cutting down new ones every time they go out to gather their daily timber. These are responsible actions to take.

2. If trees are not cut or used in some way then the fire hazards ratings would go up. Due to the forest floor being so cluttered with fallen trees. When trees that have fallen sit and decompose then



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

the oils from the wood soak up in to the soil. As this happens through out the years a thick oil film is covering the forest soil. Then if a small fire breaks out then the oils can worsen the fire's extent. Not only do the fires benifit from the natural oil they benifit from the timber that is just lieing on the forest floor as well. So by loggers cleaning up the forest floors, they not only prevent fires but also make aliving. So the rules are good all the way around. This is how Environmentalists should handle things more often. instead of rallies just agree to a list of rules.

Environmentalist and loggers should be able to work as a team to meet their seperate needs. If one group needs a sertian amount of trees. Then work



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

together to find an area that is plush
with trees and wouldn't be to damaged
by some being removed.

EXEMPLAR #9 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Stakeholder rubric for stating the stakeholders' uses of the environment without specifically addressing the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of those uses. While the response does discuss how loggers are using the environment, it does not directly address whether the consequences of this use are positive or negative. Without addressing the benefits and/or negative consequences, no more than one point can be earned on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 2 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue but providing little or no support for that solution. Although the suggestion to “get along” (or “work as a team”) might ultimately help in this fractious debate, the solution is not supported with any specific details. Without supporting the solution, no more than one point can be earned on this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it uses only anecdotal information to support its ideas and claims. Although relevant statistics and information are provided throughout the essay, they are not specifically cited and there is no evidence of primary sources being used.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

Please complete your final written response in the space provided

Name _____ Grade Level 11 Date 3-12-2004

Name of CBA Humans & the Environment

When you think of fishing and hunting what comes to mind? Fun to do right, whats the problem with fishing and hunting. Well, there are problems with fishing and hunting. On the rest of this essay I will write about these specific topics. I will define the issue, explain how multiple groups compete over the environment, explain how multiple groups compete over the environment, describe a possible solution, explain how the solution would make the environment healthier, and how would the solution impact the competing groups.

The issue of fishing and hunting is that people want to use that land for something else other that fishing and hunting areas. People think that fishing and hunting may put animals into the endangered species. People also want to put dams or make electricity out of that area as well. To me fishing and hunting is an activity. Fishing and Hunting is something my dad, uncles,



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

brothers, friends, and many other people love to do because its fun.

Multiple groups may compete for these lands. These groups want to use this land for other puposes other than fishing and hunting. The things that these multiple groups may want to use this land for are boating, canoeing, dams, electricity, and many other possible things. For hunting areas they might log it and make a house, make it a camping site, grazing, or just keep it from being hunted.

A possible solution for all of these problems over fishing and hunting is to make certain areas specifically for fishing and hunting. The government should buy pieces of land and mark them as fishing and hunting areas. These grounds should always be open for specific hunting and fishing seasons. Private owned areas should start taking more time to take care of their property so now one hunts or fishes in their area.



STUDENT RESPONSE BOOKLET

— Continued —

This solution would make the environment healthier in a way. Many areas where you would be able to hunt would be there anymore because a solution. In other areas where there has never been any fishing and hunting may open for all people. This may start an uproar in the beginning but I think it would be a good solution. Many unsafe areas may be replaced with safer areas. Many animals would be able to reproduce in some areas and in some areas it would be a chance to make more space for the animals.

The solution will impact the competing groups in a certain way. The fisherman and hunters would like the population of the animals, but may dislike the distance they may have to travel. The environmentalist would like that the areas used for fishing and hunting are in a safer place, but still dislike the fact that fishing and hunting are in a different place. No matter what anyone does both groups won't agree with everything that happens.

EXEMPLAR #10 ANNOTATION

Stakeholder Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Stakeholder rubric for stating the stakeholders' uses of the environment without specifically addressing the positive benefits and/or negative consequences of those uses. While the response does recognize how hunters and fishermen are using the environment, it does not address what is good or bad about their use. Without addressing the benefits and/or negative consequences, no more than one point can be earned on this rubric.

Solution/Alternative Rubric

Score: 1

This response earns the score of 1 on the Solution/Alternative rubric for proposing a reasonable solution to the environmental issue with one reason explicitly supported by accurate evidence. Although the response proposes that a solution to the debate over hunting and fishing would be to designate certain areas solely for those uses while making other areas completely free from them, the solution is not supported with any specific details. Without supporting the solution, no more than one point can be earned on this rubric.

Sources Rubric

Score: 1

The response earns the score of 1 on the Sources rubric because it uses only anecdotal information to support its ideas and claims. Although relevant statistics and information are provided throughout the essay, they are not specifically cited and there is no evidence of primary sources being used.