
AP Seminar Performance Assessment Task 1

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Individual Research Report

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

AP Seminar Rubric 2017-18

Individual Research Report

		Performance Levels			Points (Max)
Row	Content Area/ Proficiency	Low	Medium	High	
1	Understand and Analyze Context	The report identifies an overly broad or simplistic area of investigation and/or shows little evidence of research. A simplistic connection or no connection is made to the overall problem or issue.	The report identifies an adequately focused area of investigation in the research and shows some variety in source selection. It makes some reference to the overall problem or issue.	The report situates the student's investigation of the complexities of a problem or issue in research that draws upon a wide variety of appropriate sources. It makes clear the significance to a larger context.	6
		2	4	6	
2	Understand and Analyze Argument	The report restates or misstates information from sources. It doesn't address reasoning in the sources or it does so in a very simplistic way.	The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).	The report demonstrates an understanding of the reasoning and validity of the sources' arguments.* This can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use of the reasoning and conclusions.	6
		2	4	6	
3	Evaluate Sources and Evidence	The report identifies evidence from chosen sources. It makes very simplistic, illogical, or no reference to the credibility of sources and evidence, and their relevance to the inquiry.	The report in places offers some effective explanation of the chosen sources and evidence in terms of their credibility and relevance to the inquiry (but does so inconsistently).	The report demonstrates evaluation of credibility of the sources and selection of relevant evidence from the sources. Both can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use.	6
		2	4	6	
4	Understand and Analyze Perspective	The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**	The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**	The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**	6
		2	4	6	

AP Seminar Rubric 2017-18

Individual Research Report (continued)

Row	Content Area/ Proficiency	Performance Levels			Points (Max)
		Low	Medium	High	
5	Apply Conventions	The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete. 1	The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style. 2	The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style. 3	3
6	Apply Conventions	The report contains many flaws in grammar that often interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is not appropriate for an academic audience. 1	The report is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is inconsistent and not always appropriate for an academic audience. 2	The report communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style). The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience. 3	3

*For the purposes of AP Seminar, “validity” is defined in the glossary of the CED as “the extent to which an argument or claim is logical.”

** For the purposes of AP Seminar, “perspective” is defined in the glossary of the CED as “a point of view conveyed through an argument.”

Additional Scores

In addition to the scores represented on the rubrics, readers can also assign scores of **0** (zero) and **NR** (No Response).

0 (Zero)

- A score of **0** is assigned to a single row of the rubric when the response displays a below-minimum level of quality as identified in that row of the rubric. For rows 1 to 4, if there is no evidence of any research (i.e. it is all opinion and there is nothing in the bibliography, no citation or attributed phrases in the response) then a score of **0** should be assigned.
- Scores of **0** are assigned to all rows of the rubric when the response is off-topic; a repetition of a prompt; entirely crossed-out; a drawing or other markings; or a response in a language other than English.

NR (No Response)

A score of **NR** is assigned to responses that are blank.

ANALYZING THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING
USING CRISPR-CAS9 SYSTEMS

Analyzing the Safety and Feasibility of Human Germline Editing Using CRISPR-Cas9 Systems

Word Count: 1270

(not including title page and references)

ANALYZING THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING USING CRISPR-CAS9 SYSTEMS

The focus of our group for this project is genetic engineering in human embryos, or human germline editing. Our research question following this topic is “To what extent should CRISPR-Cas9 be limited when genetically editing the human germline?” CRISPR-Cas9, or clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats and associated protein 9, is a system modified from a bacterial immune system that can be used to find and insert, delete, or edit any piece of DNA. This technology was discovered/developed in 2015 and is much more efficient, easy to use, and inexpensive than past technologies such as zinc finger nucleases (ZFNs) and transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs). Because CRISPR-Cas9 is such an improvement over what already existed, it has opened many new possibilities that would have been much more difficult before. One of these possibilities, among others, is human germline editing.

Human germline editing is any process that changes the DNA of a germ (or reproductive) cell to be passed down to the next and following generations. This does not include genetic edits in somatic cells that would only affect some parts of an individual and would not be passed down to the next generation. We chose this topic because it is relatively specific, compared to gene editing in general, but still has a broad range of perspectives. Despite recent attempts to reach it, there is no broad consensus about human germline editing, within both the scientific community and the wider public. However, because CRISPR-Cas9 is so accessible, a consensus needs to be met.

The debates surrounding human germline editing have many different facets including ethical, social, economic, political, historical, and scientific. This paper will focus on the scientific side, because if human germline editing is not possible scientifically, the rest of the debates are pointless. As such, this paper will analyze the safety and feasibility of human germline editing, the main scientific issues.

Currently, there are three main safety concerns regarding our current practices for germline editing: mosaicism, off-target changes, and side effects of the new gene. Mosaicism is when the cells in an embryo are not uniformly edited, with a mix of “fixed” and unchanged cells. This usually occurs when CRISPR-Cas9 does not act quickly enough and the cells start to split before the DNA has been edited. Off-target changes are edits in the DNA at places other than the intended target. CRISPR-Cas9 is not perfect and makes mistakes when searching for the correct set of base pairs. Side effects of the new gene can occur when we don’t know all of the functions

ANALYZING THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING USING CRISPR-CAS9 SYSTEMS

of a gene. Many genes have multiple functions and it is nearly impossible to know what will happen exactly when a gene is changed.

The first two, mosaicism and off-target changes, were evident in the three studies that attempted to edit genes in embryos. The first two, done in China in 2015 and 2016, used trippronuclear embryos (which are nonviable), to avoid the ethical debate surrounding the use of viable embryos. Besides being nonviable, trippronuclear embryos are suitable stand-ins for regular embryos. The results were only partially successful. Mosaicism was prevalent and off-target mutations were present. (Kang et al., 2016; Liang et al., 2015) These results indicate that while CRISPR-Cas9 is much better than previous technologies, the technology itself and the practices for its use both need to be much improved in order for it to be safe for human germline editing. The latest study, conducted in 2017, had better results because CRISPR-Cas9 was added at the same time as the sperm, instead of after fertilization, resulting in less prevalent mosaicism. In addition, no off-target changes were found. (Ma et al., 2017) This shows that the technology and practices are improving and that eventually mosaicism and off-target changes can be brought down to a minimum. These three studies were all published in peer-reviewed academic journals and seemed to follow good experiment procedures. They are all controversial, but this is largely due to the controversy that surrounds human germline editing and research with embryos in general, not the studies in particular.

A speech given at the International Summit on Human Gene Editing in 2015, elaborates on the third issue. Eric Lander, an expert in the human genome who even played an important role in the Human Genome Project, spoke about the complexity of disease and its relationship with human genetics. The genetic root behind a disease can be very difficult to find, requiring massive amounts of data, and even when a gene is known to be connected, exactly how the connection works is usually not known. Additionally, with polygenic diseases, most of the genes only have a small impact in risk of contracting the disease. Mendelian diseases, diseases that are caused by a single mutation, would be much easier to prevent, but even then many genes have multiple purposes. A gene that makes someone more vulnerable to one disease might protect them from another. (Lander, 2015) Obviously, there is a lot about genetics and disease that remains unknown and while this knowledge gap remains, we won't be able to tell exactly what will happen when we change a gene.

ANALYZING THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING USING CRISPR-CAS9 SYSTEMS

According to one group of scientists, this unpredictability means that human germline editing is not worth it. They called for a voluntary moratorium against human germline editing due to its lack of safety. They also argued that any therapy offered by human germline editing could be achieved using other techniques, so it was not worth the risks. If anyone did move forward with it and something went wrong, somatic gene therapy might be associated with germline editing and be negatively affected by any negative public reaction. (Lanphier, Urnov, Haecker, Werner, & Smolenski, 2015) This would definitely harm the authors of the article, as all of them are involved with somatic gene therapy. Given their involvement in this field it should be kept in mind that they would also stand to benefit from a ban of human germline editing as it would most likely be competition to somatic gene therapy. So it stands to reason that they would be biased against human germline editing. Nevertheless, their position is valid.

The organizing committee of the International Summit on Human Gene Editing took a different position however. In their statement, they stated that basic and preclinical research is needed and that studies using human embryos were acceptable, as long as the embryos did not result in a pregnancy. Instead of warning off human germline editing entirely, they approved of moving forward with proper precautions. The key safety issues mentioned before would need to be solved and the safety of the human germline editing would need to be demonstrated before it would be available for clinical use (including both clinical research and therapy). (Organizing Committee for the International Summit on Human Gene Editing, 2015) The organizing committee was made up of experts in the field and was obviously more open minded about human germline editing. They looked at the issue from multiple lenses and perspectives throughout the summit and based the statement off of the cases made at the summit. The summit was sponsored by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. National Academy of Medicine, the Royal Society, and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, all authorities on science and medicine.

Human germline editing using CRISPR-Cas9 is not yet safe enough to be feasible for clinical use, which is why further research is required. With more research and improvement on the technology and practices, the safety of the human germline editing could improve to be safe enough for clinical use, if ethical, social, and other debates are resolved.

ANALYZING THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF HUMAN GERMLINE EDITING
USING CRISPR-CAS9 SYSTEMS

References

- Kang, X., He, W., Huang, Y., Yu, Q., Chen, Y., Gao, X., ... Fan, Y. (2016) Introducing precise genetic modifications into human 3PN embryos by CRISPR/Cas-mediated genome editing. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*, 33(5), 581-588.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-016-0710-8>
- Lander, E. S. (2015) What we don't know. In *International Summit on Human Gene Editing: A Global Discussion Commissioned Papers*. Retrieved from
http://nationalacademies.org/cs/groups/pgasite/documents/webpage/pga_170455.pdf
- Lanphier, E., Urnov, F., Haecker, S. E., Werner, M., Smolenski, J. (2015). Don't edit the human germ line. *Nature*, 519(7544), 410-411. <http://doi.org/10.1038/519410a>
- Liang, P., Xu, Y., Zhang, X., Chenhui, D., Huang, R., Zhang, Z., ... Huang, J. (2015). CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene editing in human tripronuclear zygotes. *Protein & Cell*, 6(5), 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13238-015-0153-5>
- Ma, H., Marti-Gutierrez, N., Park, S., Wu, J., Lee, Y., Suzuki, K., ... Mitalipov, S. (2017). Correction of a pathogenic gene mutation in human embryos. *Nature*, 458, 413-419.
<http://doi.org/10.1038/nature23305>
- Organizing Committee for the International Summit on Human Gene Editing. (2015, December 3). *On Human Gene Editing: International Summit Statement*. Retrieved from
<http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=12032015a>

AP Seminar

1/25/18

Hazing and the Law

In February of 2017, Penn State sophomore, Timothy Piazza, died as a result of a collapsed lung, ruptured spleen, and irreparable brain damage. After a night of forced pledge drinking, the consumption of mass quantities of alcohol with intent to ‘induct’ Piazza into the Penn State chapter of Beta Theta Pi, intoxicated Piazza fell down stairs, and the other fraternity members failed to call an ambulance or authorities until 12 hours after he had fallen (Snyder, 2017). As of November of 2017, seventeen Beta Theta Pi fraternity members have been charged in connection with the event, charges ranging from giving alcohol to a minor to involuntary manslaughter and aggravated assault, as well as hazing (Shapiro, 2017). Hazing is a buzzword without a solid definition, a word that without context is hard to apply. Merriam-Webster defines hazing as “the action of hazing; especially: an initiation process involving harassment.”. However, this does not begin to define its ramifications in current society. A 2008 University of Maine National Study reported that 55% of university students report being hazed at some point in their college careers (Allan et al, 14). The Penn State case has brought the question of hazing law and it’s meaningful prevention of tragedies like this back into the limelight. On every legal level, the legal definition of what constitutes as hazing and what the punishments should be are under scrutiny. But perhaps most importantly what can legally be done to further prevent hazing deaths.

One of the major questions of this debate is what exactly can be defined as hazing in a court of law. In Pennsylvania state statute § 5352 regarding hazing outlines a “ definition” some

of the actions that can be defined as hazing, it includes any brutality of a physical nature—whipping, beating, branding, etc—forced consumption of any food, liquor, or drug, sleep deprivation, embarrassing situations or conduct, or destruction or removal of public or private property (Anti Hazing Law, P.L. 229, No. 31 Cl. 24) . However, in other states, such as Indiana, hazing is vaguely defined as the conditional or consensual coercion of another person “to perform an act that creates a substantial risk of bodily injury.” (Hazing; good faith reporting). Currently, only 44 states have legal definitions and laws and statutes regarding hazing. Montana, New Mexico, South Dakota, Wyoming, Alaska, and Hawaii all do not have hazing laws (Interactive: Where is Hazing a Crime). In the states that do have hazing laws, there is a distinct difference state to state regarding punishments on a state level. As defined by Pennsylvania statute § 5352, hazing is a misdemeanor of the third degree, a charge punishable by up to one year in prison a fine of up to \$2,000. However, in California, hazing can either be a misdemeanor or a felony based on the severity of the event, as defined by California Penal Code. In the event or hazing resulting in a death or injury is a misdemeanor or felony, punishable by a fine and jail time (PENAL CODE Chapter 9. Assault and Battery [240 - 248]). In fact, most punishment varies highly from state to state.

This is one of the major controversies in hazing law, what the implications of state-by-state variances in punishment and the question of what is too much and too little as far as disciplinary action. In the Piazza Case, William Brennan, the attorney for one of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity brothers, states that he believes that the charges are too severe for the crime and stated, “Not every tragedy is a crime”(Snyder). In an equal but opposite measure, Hank Newer, an associate professor of journalism and an expert in hazing with several books released

on the subject states, “Hazing cases are not the same state to state, and that it has been a shame, in my opinion, no legislator has put together a bipartisan and effective and constitutional anti-hazing bill,” (Dostis). Some are seeking hazing laws that are fairer towards defendants, and others believe they should be far more severe so as to prevent hazing.

Regardless or not if a state has hazing legislation, most universities have their own hazing policies. Pennsylvania State University uses a nearly identical definition based on the state statute, and also informs students that there are state laws regarding hazing (Hazing Information, Penn State Student Union). At the University of New Mexico, despite the state itself not having a hazing law or statute, the university outlines its hazing definition in a similar manner (UNM Policy Against Hazing). In addition to state charges, colleges will include their own punishments. Duke University’s hazing policy is outlined very clearly with three levels of severity. The punishments for these are also clearly defined: “disciplinary probation, social suspension, suspension of charter, restrictions on member recruitment and/or group activity, removal of the individual from the group, loss of housing privileges, suspension, and/or expulsion” on a basis of severity of the infraction (Duke Policies: Hazing). However, even on a university level, this is under scrutiny, Dillard College President, Walter Kimbrough, said in a 2012 article for Presidency magazine that he believes more steps need to be taken on the behalfs of universities to create zero tolerance hazing protocols; concise definitions with concise punishments. He states, “Bear in mind that if ‘zero tolerance’ does not mean suspension or expulsion, it is not truly a zero-tolerance policy.”. However, Kimbrough also states that he believes there is a difference between what should be in university jurisdiction and what should

be in the hands of authorities, thus again leading into the question of the uneven state to state hazing laws.

With both a university and state level of hazing policy called into question in light of the Piazza case, the idea for new federal legislation has been introduced, including the REACH bill. The REACH act proposed by Representative Patrick Meehan would create a national definition for hazing (Snyder). It would require universities to report hazing incidents to authorities as well provide on-campus hazing education. So as to take into account all opinions in this argument a comprehensive study is being done into on-campus crime and hazing reports to better understanding hazing trends. (Carter)

As of the current era, it can be seen that recent events and a past that supports a disturbing trend in hazing deaths and injuries has spurred a new era of debate regarding hazing law. Though there are those who support hazings' place in Greek life on campus, overwhelmingly there is a movement to better define and punish it so as to prevent further tragedies on a meaningful, national scale.

Word Count: 1104

References

- Allan, Elizabeth J., and Mary Madden. *Hazing in View: College Students at Risk*. University of Maine, 2008, pp. 1–52, *Hazing in View: College Students at Risk*.
- ANTI HAZING LAW - ENFORCEMENT Act of May. 24, 2016,P.L. 229, No. 31 Cl. 24
- Carter, S. Daniel. “Bi-Partisan Anti-Hazing Bill In Congress Draws Widespread Support.” *The Huffington Post*, TheHuffingtonPost.com, 21 June 2017,
www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/bi-partisan-anti-hazing-bill-in-congress-draws-widespread_us_594ac56ce4b062254f3a5b0a.
- Dostis, Melanie. “Hazing Embedded in College Culture?” *USA Today*, Gannett Satellite Information Network, 21 Nov. 2013,
policies.duke.edu/students/universitywide/hazing.php.
- HAZING; GOOD FAITH REPORTING Act of 2015, IC 35-42-2-2.5,
 “Hazing Information.” *Fraternity & Sorority Life | Hazing Information*, 2017,
studentaffairs.psu.edu/hub/greeks/hazing.shtml.
- “Interactive: Where Hazing Is a Crime in the U.S.” *NBCNews.com*, NBCUniversal News Group, 18 Sept. 2017,
www.nbcnews.com/storyline/hazing-in-america/interactive-where-hazing-crime-u-s-n801796.

Jackson, Abby. "Hazing Is Nothing New - Fraternities Have Been Beating and Force-Feeding Pledges since Colonial Times." *Business Insider*, Business Insider, 30 Sept. 2017, www.businessinsider.com/fraternities-hazing-pledges-history-2017-9.

Kimbrough, Walter. "Handling Hazing." *Presidency*, Fall 2012, pp. 1-3. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=93681798&site=ehost-live.

Parks, Gregory Scott, et al. "Hazing as Crime: An Empirical Analysis of Criminological Antecedents." *By Gregory Scott Parks, Shayne E. Jones, Matthew W. Hughey :: SSRN*, 7 Mar. 2014, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2405079.

Shapiro, Emily. "Former Penn State Fraternity Brothers Face New Charges in Hazing Death." *ABC News*, ABC News Network, 13 Nov. 2017, abcnews.go.com/US/charges-penn-state-hazing-death/story?id=51112120.

Snyder, Susan. "Meehan Proposes Federal Legislation on Hazing." *Philly.com*, 16 June 2017, www.philly.com/philly/education/meehan-proposes-federal-legislation-on-hazing-20170616.html.

Snyder, Susan. "Penn State Frat Death Raises Questions for Grieving Parents." *Philly.com*, Philadelphia Media Network LLC, 9 Apr. 2017, www.philly.com/philly/education/Frat-death-raises-questions-for-grieving-parents.html.

Svrluga, Susan. "New Charges Brought in Penn State Hazing Death after Deleted Video Is Recovered." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 15 Nov. 2017,

“The Pathfinder - UNM Student Handbook.” *UNM Policy Against Hazing :: The Pathfinder - UNM Student Handbook | The University of New Mexico*,
pathfinder.unm.edu/campus-policies/unm-policy-against-hazing.html.

PENAL CODE Chapter 9. Assault and Battery [240 - 248]- Act of 1872

“Why Do People Haze?” *Stop Hazing | Georgetown University*,
stophazing.georgetown.edu/why-do-people-haze.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

AP Seminar

31 January 18

How clothing resellers hurt the community socially

Clothing resellers don't realize them trying to make a quick buck can be putting a negative impact on the clothing community socially. People will wait in the lines lasting hours even sometimes days just to get the new releases on brands such as supreme just to have the soul purpose to buy and resell it for so much more than it's worth. Reselling causes people to buy stuff they actually wanna wear for a price so marked up, and since the item is so hyped at the moment this gives a chance for people to sell faked as real and make a huge profit, and there's just a huge trust issue on what is real and what is fake now in the community.

First off most resellers don't even care about or respect the clothes and the brand they are buying. Their main goal is to just resell the clothes at a obscene price. Complex new a company that follows up on the most recent trends, hype clothing and hollywood news conducted a youtube video (Here's What Happened at Supreme's First Drop of the Spring/Summer 2016 Season) where they visited the spring/ summer Supreme drop and interviewed resellers and what they think and what are there plans to do with what they purchased. Emily oberg asked quite a few people and one response was “ Imma get five sets of everything to resell... i have five people in line to buy for me”. This man has five people in line for him to buy supreme stuff to where he can resell them and make a quick buck. That means there could've been five other

people in line who actually wanted to buy the stuff and who cared about the item and the culture of Supreme but their spots are taken by someone whose main goal is just to resell. In the same video Emily asked a man what is your favorite part about NAS a famous rapper who ended up having a collab with Supreme during this drop and his response is “can't tell you what he did in life.... He made me a couple of dollars today”. He doesn't even know who the rapper is on his shirt that he has bought and like he said he was just there to make that quick buck. So now someone who actually wanted that shirt isn't gonna be able to get it for the retail price and will now have to pay double maybe even triple the price then what it went for retail.

There are people out there who will try and sell you fakes of the pieces you're wanting to buy and take advantage of you on your knowledge of them. There are many websites that will sell fake clothing and shoes. Websites like eBay, Poshmark and others offer a huge variety of fake clothing and sneakers and a lot on where you wouldn't even be able to tell the difference without being an expert on clothing. They will buy fake clothes and will sell them to you for the same price as if they were real and take advantage of your lack of knowledge. This is almost the same as a scam artist who takes advantage of elderly people to and get their credit as said in *Fraud Against Seniors*.. These scammers will take advantage of these elderly's people for being old and not knowing any better and will just steal all their info and money and can seriously ruin their lives. The way that some clothing resellers try and make their money is basically the same as those scammers. They don't care if you're young old or elderly they're just trying to make money. This is where that trust comes in again, you might end up buying a real piece of clothing but with all the amount of fakes out there people will probably end up thinking it's not real. The clothing resellers break the trust within the clothing community.

A man by the name Yeezy Busta is a social media public figure with over 713k followers (@Yeezybusta) who knows everything it has to do with the shoes Yeezys being real or fake. He exposes famous celebrities for wearing fake Yeezys and this has in the passed hurt celebrities images over social media and sometimes in real life. The reason why this is important is because most of the time the people who he has exposed has bought there Yeezy from resellers who ended up selling them fake shoes claiming they're real and they will end up paying that full top price for these fake shoes and these celebrities will take pictures wearing these shoes and post them on their social media accounts and Yeezy Busta will end up exposing them on his instagram account if they are fake. His main goal is not to damage the celebrities career but to try and expose on what is fake and what is real within our clothing community whether it has to do with celebrities buying fakes directly from fake online places or of them being scammed by resellers who are selling fake product.

An example of a reseller hurting someone socially over the internet is when Yeezy busta ended up exposing a famous Youtuber by the name of Tanner Fox. Yeezy busta on a youtube video (THESE YOUTUBERS HAVE FAKE YEEZYS... (Ft. YEEZYBUSTA) *Jake Paul, Ricegum, and More...*) ended up exposing him for wearing fake Turtle Dove Yeezys and people were not quite about it. Fans ended up going social media and commenting on a picture (Instagram Post by Yeezy Busta • Nov 7, 2016 at 10:32pm UTC) of him wearing the fake Yeezys and basically made fun of him and saying a lot of very unnecessary stuff just because of wearing fake Yeezys. Yeezy Busta did state in the video (THESE YOUTUBERS HAVE FAKE YEEZYS... (Ft. YEEZYBUSTA) *Jake Paul, Ricegum, and More...*) that Tanner did reach out to him and that he did buy his Shoes from a reseller for the price of a real yeezy and basically got

scammed. This has not just happened to Tanner but a whole lot more of other celebrities who've been hurt socially by resellers.

If clothing resellers would stop purchasing these limited supply products and let the people who actually cared about the brands and what they buy get these clothes or shoes a lot of the problems would stop. They would be able to just directly buy from the retailer where it's the normal price and you know it's real and we would be able to start slowly bringing that trust back into the clothing community. Once they stop trying to make that quick buck that's when we can start rebuilding what should already be built within our community.

Works Cited

Complexmagazine. "Here's What Happened at Supreme's First Drop of the Spring/Summer 2016 Season." *YouTube*, YouTube, 19 Feb. 2016,
www.youtube.com/watch?v=kS-AnD3bQtQ&t=16s

"Fraud Against Seniors." *FBI*, FBI, 15 June 2016,
www.fbi.gov/scams-and-safety/common-fraud-schemes/seniors.

"THESE YOUTUBERS HAVE FAKE YEEZYS... (Ft. YEEZYBUSTA) *Jake Paul, Ricegum, and More...*." *YouTube*, YouTube, 26 July 2017,
www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuAihUtdb3U.

"Instagram Post by Yeezy Busta • Nov 7, 2016 at 10:32pm UTC." *Instagram*,
www.instagram.com/p/BMhpu9Dj7t1/?hl=en.

"Yeezy Busta (@Yeezybusta) • Instagram Photos and Videos." *Instagram*,
www.instagram.com/yeezybusta/?hl=en.

AP[®] SEMINAR

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Performance Task 1

Individual Research Report

Overview

This prompt assessed students' ability to:

- Investigate a particular approach, range of perspectives, or lens of the team's research project;
- Conduct academic/scholarly research relevant to the issue or topic;
- Produce an evaluative, analytic report about research on the chosen academic or real-world problem or issue;
- Analyze reasoning within the research literature; and
- Analyze the relevance of evidence and credibility of sources.

Sample: A

1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 6

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 6

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 6

4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 6

5 Apply Conventions Score: 3

6 Apply Conventions Score: 3

HIGH SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand & Analyze Context (6)

This report earned a score of 6 for this row because the report situates a specific problem (a specific technology in use for Human Germline Editing) within the context of academic research on safety and feasibility. It clearly states the significance of the problem (lack of consensus surrounding the procedure and implications for medicine). The research balances documents from an international academic summit with academic journals, including *Nature*, which is a premier journal in the sciences.

Row 2: Understand & Analyze Argument (6)

This report earned a score of 6 for this row because it clearly narrates a research story, tracing the current thinking on feasibility and safety. There is evidence of analysis of the reasoning in specific research sources. [e.g., page 3, "These results indicate that while CRISPR-Cas9 is much better than previous technologies, the technology itself and the practices for its use both need to be much improved in order for it to be safe for human germline editing." Or page 3, "The latest study, conducted in 2017, had better results because CRISPR-Cas9 was added at the same time as the sperm, instead of after fertilization, resulting in less prevalent mosaicism." Note: "mosaicism" has earlier been defined.]

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence (6)

This report earned a score of 6 for this row because the sources selected are credible and relevant (purposeful use). Additionally, the report makes use of direct evaluation [e.g., page 3, "Eric lander, an expert in the human genome who even played an important role in the Human Genome Project." Or page 4, about the summit: "The summit was sponsored by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. National Academy of Medicine, the Royal Society, and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, all authorities on science and medicine."]

AP[®] SEMINAR

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report

Row 4: Understand & Analyze Perspective (6)

This report earned a score of 6 for this row because it gleans perspectives from the articles and puts them in conversation with one another. Transitions are abundant and clear. [e.g., page 4, “According to one group of scientists, this unpredictability means that human germline editing is not worth it.” Or page 4, “Instead of warning off human germline editing entirely, they approved of moving with forward with proper precautions.”]

Row 5: Apply Convention (Attribution) (3)

This report earned a score of 3 for this row because, for the most part, it accurately and consistently attributes sources. One might expect to see a citation in the opening paragraph, although within the field, the definition and history are likely foundational knowledge. Studies are carefully cited.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar & Style) (3)

This report earned a score of 3 for this row because complex material was carefully presented through controlled sentences. There are some shifts in tone when the author moves into commentary but overall there are few flaws. The conclusion is a model of precision.

Sample: B

1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 4

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 4

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 4

4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 4

5 Apply Conventions Score: 2

6 Apply Conventions Score: 2

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand & Analyze Context (4)

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because there is an adequately focused topic (hazing and law). It does, however, cover too many aspects of the problem (numerous state and university laws). The bibliography of 18 sources demonstrates some variety, including some internal university publications and two laws. Overall, the research over-represents news sources. There are no academic journals represented.

Row 2: Understand & Analyze Argument (4)

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because it addresses a salient argument in the sources (the “state-by-state variances in punishment” and varying “disciplinary action.”) Much of the report, however, is summary of the laws and university policies.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence (4)

The report earned a score of 4 for this row because while some of the evidence is purposely used (namely, the evidence from universities about their policies), the report frequently uses news pieces as sources of evidence. [e.g., on bottom of page 2, the writer uses the attributive phrase, “Hank Newer, an associate professor of journalism and an expert in hazing.” However, the evidence is derived from a news source, and the credibility of that news source is not evaluated. *NBCNews.com* and *Huffington Post* are similarly used.]

Row 4: Understand & Analyze Perspective (4)

The report earned a score of 4 because a number of perspectives were included, including different state laws and university policies, but connections among them are inconsistently made and generally assumed.

AP[®] SEMINAR

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Performance Task 1 Individual Research Report

Row 5: Apply Convention (Attribution) (2)

The report earned a score of 3 for this row because citations do not contain all necessary elements (e.g., “HAZING; GOOD FAITH REPORTING Act of 2015, IC 35-42-2-2.5,” — where is this Act from?) and are inconsistently formatted (e.g., inconsistent treatment of titles & indentations; “PENAL CODE” not in alphabetical order). While many of the internal citations match to the bibliography, some do so unclearly, and a few items on the bibliography are not referenced in the text.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Style) (2)

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the sentences are not always controlled and at times do not communicate ideas clearly. Punctuation is haphazard. [e.g., “In Pennsylvania state statute § 5352 regarding hazing outlines a ‘definition’ some of the actions that can be defined as hazing, it includes any brutality of a physical nature — whipping, beating, branding, etc. — forced consumption of any food, liquor, or drug, sleep deprivation, embarrassing situations or conduct, or destruction or removal of public or private property (Anti Hazing Law, P.L. 229, No. 31 Cl. 24).” Or “However, even on a university level, this is under scrutiny, Dillard College President, Walter Kimbrough, said in a 2012 article for *Presidency* magazine that he believes more steps need to be taken on the behalfs [*sic*] of universities to create zero tolerance hazing protocols; concise definitions with concise punishments.”]

Sample: C

1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 2

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 2

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 2

4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 2

5 Apply Conventions Score: 1

6 Apply Conventions Score: 1

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand & Analyze Context (2)

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because there is little evidence of research for this report. The Works Cited contains five sources, four of which are from YouTube and Instagram. The FBI “Fraud Against Seniors” source is unrelated (or very tenuously related) to the topic of clothing resellers.

Row 2: Understand & Analyze Argument (2)

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because it restates information from the sources. [e.g., on bottom of page 1, top of page 2, the report describes the interviews that *Complex* conducted, but it doesn’t place these interviews in the context of an argument.]

AP[®] SEMINAR
2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence (2)

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the statements concerning credibility and relevance are simplistic, illogical, or absent. [e.g., on page 2, the FBI “Fraud Against Seniors” source is not tightly connected to the clothing resellers issue. Or, on page 3, it’s unclear how or why Yeezy Busta’s social media presence makes this a credible source.]

Row 4: Understand & Analyze Perspective (2)

The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the identification of perspectives in the sources is oversimplified. The Yeezy Busta material is the most developed part of the report, but the perspective for this argument is oversimplified — something like, people (including celebrities) are scammed into buying fake Yeezys, and this is bad.

Row 5: Apply Convention (Attribution) (1)

The report earned a score of 1 for this row because the Works Cited is inconsistently formatted in terms of titles and other essential elements (cp. the Instagram citations). The sources are neither alphabetized nor numbered. The *Time* source mentioned in the text does not appear in the bibliography.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Style) (1)

The report earned 1 for this row because the tone is not appropriate for an academic task, and word choice is overly general [e.g., from introduction, “Reselling causes people to buy stuff they actually wanna wear for a price so marked up, and since the item is so hyped at the moment this gives a chance for people to sell faked as real and make a huge profit, and there’s just a huge trust issue on what is real and what is fake now in the community.”].