

2023

AP[®]



AP[®] Seminar End-of-Course Exam

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary Set 1

Inside:

Part A

- Scoring Guidelines**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

© 2023 College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of College Board. AP Capstone is a trademark owned by College Board. Visit College Board on the web: collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.

End-of-Course Exam: Part A

15 points

General Scoring Notes

- When applying the scoring guidelines, you should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence (i.e. best fit).
- Except where otherwise noted, each row is scored independently.

0 (Zero)

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.

Question 1: Argument, main idea, or thesis

3 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria							
<p>Row 1</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Argument</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p>1 point</p> <p>The response misstates the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The response accurately identifies the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>				
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes								
<p>(0-3 points)</p>	<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are irrelevant to the argument (do not even relate to the topic or subject of the text) 	<p>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misidentify the main argument or provide little or no indication of understanding of any part of the main argument. Just state the topic of the argument. Restate the title or heading. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately identify only part of the argument (part is omitted or is overgeneralized). Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly identify all of the main parts of the argument. Demonstrate understanding of the argument as a whole. 				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"></td> <td style="width: 25%;"> <p>Examples that earn 1 point:</p> <p>Misidentify the main argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The press and politicians lie to the public.”</i> <p>Restate the title or heading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Full-day kindergarten is failing our children.”</i> </td> <td style="width: 25%;"> <p>Examples that earn 2 points</p> <p>Identify only part of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Studies showed that full-day kindergarten programs benefited disadvantaged students in some categories.”</i> <i>“Full-day kindergarten programs are too expensive to implement based on study results.”</i> <p>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“There’s disagreement over whether kids need kindergarten because it doesn’t benefit everyone and it’s too expensive.”</i> </td> <td style="width: 25%;"> <p>Examples that earn 3 points:</p> <p>Include all parts of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Despite the big demand for it, a study showed that full day kindergarten is not worth the expense. While it may benefit disadvantaged students, it had either no effect or negative outcomes for most students, including those with special needs, so should not be implemented.”</i> </td> </tr> </table>						<p>Examples that earn 1 point:</p> <p>Misidentify the main argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The press and politicians lie to the public.”</i> <p>Restate the title or heading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Full-day kindergarten is failing our children.”</i> 	<p>Examples that earn 2 points</p> <p>Identify only part of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Studies showed that full-day kindergarten programs benefited disadvantaged students in some categories.”</i> <i>“Full-day kindergarten programs are too expensive to implement based on study results.”</i> <p>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“There’s disagreement over whether kids need kindergarten because it doesn’t benefit everyone and it’s too expensive.”</i> 	<p>Examples that earn 3 points:</p> <p>Include all parts of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Despite the big demand for it, a study showed that full day kindergarten is not worth the expense. While it may benefit disadvantaged students, it had either no effect or negative outcomes for most students, including those with special needs, so should not be implemented.”</i>
	<p>Examples that earn 1 point:</p> <p>Misidentify the main argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The press and politicians lie to the public.”</i> <p>Restate the title or heading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Full-day kindergarten is failing our children.”</i> 	<p>Examples that earn 2 points</p> <p>Identify only part of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Studies showed that full-day kindergarten programs benefited disadvantaged students in some categories.”</i> <i>“Full-day kindergarten programs are too expensive to implement based on study results.”</i> <p>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“There’s disagreement over whether kids need kindergarten because it doesn’t benefit everyone and it’s too expensive.”</i> 	<p>Examples that earn 3 points:</p> <p>Include all parts of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Despite the big demand for it, a study showed that full day kindergarten is not worth the expense. While it may benefit disadvantaged students, it had either no effect or negative outcomes for most students, including those with special needs, so should not be implemented.”</i> 					
<p>Additional Notes</p> <p>The Argument/thesis has three main parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Full-day kindergarten provides no advantage for most children compared to half-day programs. (Accept: should not be implemented, not feasible, unnecessary, effectiveness lacks evidence, government should eliminate—or any other similar indication that a universal change from half-day/traditional kindergarten should not happen). In the long term, full-day kindergarten does not benefit children. (Accept: is worse for students, no long-term benefits, negligible or negative impact, can create social and emotional obstacles, benefits some children and not others, cognitive skills deterred; any similar wording). Universal full-day kindergarten is not worth the expense. (Accept: not economically sound, not cost effective, funding should be used for children at risk, too expensive, unnecessary tax; any similar wording.) 								

Question 2: Explain line of reasoning

6 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria							
<p>Row 2</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Argument</p> <p>(0-6 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The response correctly identifies at least one of the author’s claims.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>The response provides a limited explanation of the author’s line of reasoning by accurately identifying some of the claims AND identifying the connections or acknowledging a relationship among them.</p>	<p>6 points</p> <p>The response provides a thorough explanation of the author’s line of reasoning by identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among them.</p>				
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="306 537 695 792" style="width: 25%;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do not identify any claims accurately. </th> <th data-bbox="695 537 1083 792" style="width: 25%;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify only one claim. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them. </th> <th data-bbox="1083 537 1545 792" style="width: 25%;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning). </th> <th data-bbox="1545 537 1950 792" style="width: 25%;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify most of the claims. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument). </th> </tr> </thead> </table>					<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do not identify any claims accurately. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify only one claim. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning). 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify most of the claims. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do not identify any claims accurately. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify only one claim. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning). 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accurately identify most of the claims. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument). 					
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this. <p>Author’s claims</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historically the first kindergartens were seen as controversial/something to be suspicious of. (Sets up historical context for contrast with present.) 2. Today there is increasing demand from governments, parents, and teachers’ unions for full-day kindergarten. (Provides context of widespread demand.) 3. Actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated. (Introduces the controversy.) 4. The Ontario government touted the benefits of full day kindergarten based on academic studies it commissioned. (Provides examples of positive claims by public officials.) 5. When the full studies were released, results were a “grave disappointment”. (Provides stark contrast to positive claims in previous section.) 6. Studies showed improvement for some students (low income and/or poor test scores) but for others results ranged from “negligible to abysmal”. (Concedes some advantages for some students but rebuts claim it is good for all.) 7. For many students, the half-day kindergarten system was more advantageous than spending all week at school. (Provides specific examples of policy failure to rebut argument it is good for all.) 8. Full-day kindergarten impedes the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from family care too early. (Provides specific examples of policy failure to rebut argument it is good for all.) 9. Gains identified for some children attending full-day kindergarten are likely temporary. (Provides supporting evidence for another reason to question the efficacy of the policy.) 10. It doesn’t make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally (should be more targeted). (Conclusion) 								

Question 3: Evaluate effectiveness of the evidence**6 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria											
Row 3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence (0-6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The response identifies little evidence. It makes a superficial reference to relevance and/or credibility but lacks explanation.	4 points The response explains various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly.	6 points The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence and thoroughly evaluates how well the evidence is used to support the author's argument.								
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="306 581 724 613" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="724 581 1129 613" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 2 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1129 581 1535 613" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 4 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1535 581 1963 613" style="width: 25%;">Typical responses that earn 6 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="306 613 724 930"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response. AND ● Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence. </td> <td data-bbox="724 613 1129 930"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims. OR ● Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence. </td> <td data-bbox="1129 613 1535 930"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument. OR ● Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail. </td> <td data-bbox="1535 613 1963 930"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence. AND ● Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response. AND ● Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims. OR ● Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument. OR ● Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence. AND ● Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented.
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response. AND ● Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims. OR ● Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument. OR ● Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence. AND ● Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented. 									
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this. ● Responses which solely evaluate sources of information and not specific pieces of evidence presented from those sources cannot score 6 for Row 3. 												

AP Seminar 2023 Scoring Guidelines

Summary of Evidence		
Source (as provided in text)	Credibility	Evidence/Relevance to claims
No source	No source	German educator Friedrich Fröebel opened the world's first kindergartens in the mid-1800s. Prussia banned his schools in 1851 because of socialist subversion and radicalism. <i>Used as evidence to introduce topic/ contextualize</i>
No source	No source	Five-year-olds in British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island all attend full-day kindergarten. <i>Supports the claim that today most governments want more kindergarten, not less.</i>
No source	No source	Ontario is currently in the fourth year of a five-year rollout for full-day junior and senior kindergarten. <i>Supports the claim that demands for full-day kindergarten in Canada are heard regularly in provinces that do not provide it.</i>
Provincial news release	Unspecified source	"In every area, students improved their readiness for Grade 1 and accelerated their development," <i>Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by the press to contrast with the actual results of the study).</i>
Liz Sandals	Education Minister	The results, which tracked students in both half-and full-day kindergarten over two years, [were] "nothing short of incredible." <i>Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by public officials to contrast with the actual results of the study).</i>
Charles Pascal	"The driving force behind Ontario's full-day program"	"It [the studies] shows the program is truly a life-changer." <i>Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by public officials to contrast with the actual results of the study).</i>
Globe and Mail	Newspaper – front page story	"Landmark study" <i>Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by the press to contrast with the actual results of the study).</i>
According to full reports of the studies mentioned in the text	No direct source	Ontario's full day kindergarten experiment cost \$1.5-billion-a-year full-day kindergarten experiment <i>Supports claim that it doesn't make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally.</i>

AP Seminar 2023 Scoring Guidelines

Provincial studies	No direct source	children attending schools marked by low income and/or poor test scores showed improvement in some categories after participating in full-day kindergarten. <i>Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.</i>
James Heckman	Nobel laureate economist	early intervention can improve school readiness for disadvantaged children <i>Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.</i>
The [provincial] report	No direct source	"To be clear, some children appear to have done worse with [full-day early learning kindergarten]." <i>Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.</i>
The [provincial] report	No direct source	The biggest failings were in the categories of emotional maturity, communication skills and general knowledge. <i>Supports claim that full-day kindergarten impedes the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from family care too early.</i>
Researchers [of the report]	No direct source	"The children with special educational needs showed superior outcomes on the measures of social competence and emotional maturity in non-[full-day early learning kindergarten] programs." <i>Supports claim that for many students, the half-day kindergarten system was more advantageous than spending all week at school.</i>
Philip DeCicca	McMaster University economist	Any positive academic effects arising from full-day kindergarten are largely gone by the end of Grade 1 <i>Supports claim that gains identified for some children attending full-day kindergarten are likely temporary.</i>
Charles Milligan, "Full-Day Kindergarten Effects on Later Academic Success."	SAGE Open, 2012 (study on California's school system)	"There were no significant differences in students who attended the all-day kindergarten program and students who attended a traditional kindergarten program." <i>Supports the idea that there are no benefits to full-day versus half-day kindergarten programs.</i>
No direct source	No direct source but easily verifiable	Alberta announced tabling plans for province-wide kindergarten because of budgetary constraints. <i>Supports claim that it doesn't make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally.</i>

---Response for Part A1---

Gillis argues that although, full-day kindergarten can be helpful for those lower income children, because of the large financial burden and negative or lack of impact it has on most students, it should not be implemented into countries as a whole.

---Response for Part A2---

Gillis starts off by comparing kindergarten schools when they were just founded to today's schools. He uses places such as British Columbia, Quebec, and New Brunswick to convey how many have moved their kindergarten students to full time. Plus, he showcased Ontario's school system that has been successful for 4 full years, going onto 5. Then, he compares to those areas that don't have full-day programs which hear many wishes to move to a full-day kindergarten. He then leads into how this issue at hand has become quite the hot topic for debate.

To begin, his first claim resolves around Ontario, the country that we learned had a very successful full-day program, and how their government had put out a study where it showed the effects that a full-day Kindergarten had. This study showed that it had helped prepare students for 1st grade. Additionally, it supported this claim by having educators and government officials rave about this program with the backing of this new study.

However, in his next claim, it explains that there was no actual study to read, as they only published a fraction of the actual report. They only picked the parts that were supporting the full-time kindergarten. This is due to the study actually showing that a full-day kindergarten is negatively affecting the kids and government from both a pedagogical and financial perspective.

In Gillis's next claim he explores how full-time kindergarten affected those children apart of households that are financially burdened. He referenced multiple studies where it showed that those who are less fortunate were able to benefit from the full-time school system. However, this then led us to look at the middle and upper class students.

He then analyzed those middle to upper class students and found that the Ontario results found that the benefits from a full-time kindergarten program ranged from negligible to abysmal. For example, in the full Ontario report that he analyzed, it showed that some children appeared to have done worst with full-day kindergarten in emotional maturity, communication skills, and general knowledge. He then connected it to the complaint that some had about those programs effecting them socially and emotionally as they are being removed from familial care too early.

Then his next claim focused on those students with special needs struggling in the full-day programs. With support from the Ontario report's researchers, finding that they did much better in non-full-day kindergartens. Furthermore, he compares this performance to how many supporters of the full-day program described the program as being, in the start when only the partial report was published.

To further prove his point, Gillis explained that those who did benefit from a full-day kindergarten only experienced these benefits momentarily. As other studies had shown that these "benefits" are typically largely gone in a few years.

Gillis then concludes by explaining while it may be good for children who come from lower income families, it is not a wise choice for the country as a whole to move towards a full-day kindergarten. Additionally, warns us the readers, as taxpayers to avoid this move to a full-day kindergarten.

---Response for Part A3---

To begin with, Gillis references Friedrich Froebel who opened the first kindergartens and how he had a negative relationship with government officials, due to those governments disagreeing with the

idea of schools. However, he then goes on to explain that now most governments are promoting extending kindergartens. He then goes on to explain that areas such as British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island all attend full-day kindergarten. This supports the idea of how the evolution of education is pushing towards going to a full-day kindergarten program as these well known areas have adopted this practice.

Then in his second point, he explains how the Ontario government claimed to have a study proving the effectiveness of their full-day kindergarten. This study had shown evidence of the program better preparing a student for 1st grade. To add on to that, educator minister Liz Sandals and Charles Pascal had praised this study describing it as "nothing short of incredible" or "it shows the program is truly a life-changer". However, these people were not good sources as they had supported the full-day education program before this study was released.

On the other hand, in Gillis's next claim, he explains that the whole study was not fully published from the start. This was due to this study actually finding that a full-day kindergarten had negative impacts. This publication of only a partial report even further proves the point that those who spoke up before like education minister Liz Sandals were not good sources.

Gillis then goes on to analyze how children from all walks of life responded to the full-day kindergarten program, looking at the full Ontario study. First, he shows that those who were low income actually responded positively to this system of learning. With Nobel laureate economist James Heckman further agreeing. However, then he analyzed those who came from an average household and found that they got either negative effects or none at all from the full-day education program, which he found based off of the Ontario study. Then, to further prove his point, looking at the same source, he found that those with special needs did far worse with the full-day system. With the main pieces of evidence being from the Ontario study, and minimal outside sources, it still supports the claim of those more average households and those who are special needs, not needing full-day education. It would have further proven the point if there were more sources supporting the Ontario study.

Then, to support his claim that these positive effects that some may receive from a full-day kindergarten, he pulls upon studies conducted by McMaster University economist Philip Decicca and a study conducted on California's school system which found that these full-day kindergartens hadn't even given long lasting effects. These studies were not from the Ontario study which had provided the primary source of evidence for this document. It helped further prove the point that full-day education would be a negative for a multitude of environments.

Gillis then concludes by explaining while it may be good for children who come from lower income families, it is not a wise choice for the country as a whole to move towards a full-day kindergarten. Additionally, by showing how Alberta was going to move to a full-day kindergarten and then decided not to due to budgetary constraints, he showed that after further thinking, this may not be the wisest move.

---Response for Part A1---

The author, Charlie Gillis', argument in the passage, "Why full-day Kindergarten is failing our children" is when most governments send young children to spend a full-day at kindergarten, it is a poor use of tax money since the children are prevented from developing socially and emotionally because they are removed from their family's care too soon. This results in a lack of develop emotional maturity, communication skills, and general knowledge.

---Response for Part A2---

The author starts out by addressing the German Educator who opened the world's first kindergarten, who frequently found himself at odds with suspicious government officials and that most modern governments want more kindergartens, not less, and for a longer period of time. This builds the context to the authors' argument. Next the author brings up how the benefits that a full day at kindergarten are being debated. Connecting to their argument that a full day at kindergarten does not benefit children and it is a waste of tax money. Furthermore, children did not receive a distinct advantage of spending all week at school and some did worse, showing the connection between claims and evidence. Lastly, some poor or disadvantaged children did derive short-term benefits but it is not something that anyone with common sense should do, connecting to their argument by showing that it does not make sense to send children to kindergarten for more day and longer time.

---Response for Part A3---

The first piece of evidence that the author uses is "in every area, students improved their readiness for Grade 1 and accelerated their developments, nothing short of incredible." Giving a counter perspective by an Educator Minister Liz Sandals. Which the author promptly rebutes with "Nobel Laureate economist James Heckman, "To be clear some children appear to have done worse with [full-day kindergarten]..." Which is very effective as it shows exactly what a full day of kindergarten is not doing, developing children to be better. However, an economist talking about kindergarten is not credible. Furthermore, children with special education showed superior outcomes with a non-full-day of kindergarten. The credibility is questionable since the researchers are not named and no degrees or fields are listed. The evidence is really effective as it connects and develops the argument, but the lack of credibility takes some of that away.

---Response for Part A1---

It can be difficult to adapt and learn in an environment that you are unfamiliar with especially at a young age.

---Response for Part A2---

When explaining how this system is going to work, these children are getting separated from their parents for the entire day to better their educational learning. As a child who spends all time with their parents or guardians being taken away from them at an age such as 3 or 4 for continuous hours is going to be extremely difficult and will most likely end up with the child having behavioral issues in response to not being able to express their emotions.

---Response for Part A3---

When some agree that these children get put into all day kindergarten classes will ensure improvement in their learning abilities there are statistics to prove the opposite. In the article conducted by Charlie Gillis (2013) , it was found that "This aligns with complaints that full-day programs impede the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from familial care too early." As a child you don't completely understand what is occurring in your surroundings just yet, so to be taken away from your parents or guardians and being put in a unfamiliar environment with strangers can understandably make the child upset and confused.

End-of-Course Exam Part A: Short Answer

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Overview

This task asked students to read and understand an argument, identify the line of reasoning and evaluate the credibility and relevance of the evidence advanced by the author in support of that argument.

Sample: A

Score: 3

Score: 6

Score: 6

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **3** points because it accurately identifies all parts of the author’s argument: Establishing the problem that 1) “full-day kindergarten...should not be implemented” because the 2) “negative or lack of impact it has on most students” and 3) “the large financial burden” makes implementation not worth the expense.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **6** points because it correctly identifies most of the major claims (e.g., introducing Froebel, who “had a negative relationship with government officials,” “governments are promoting extending kindergartens,” and “full-day kindergartens hadn’t even given long lasting effects”). The response also addresses the line of reasoning using language that supports the nuances of the author’s organization. For example, the response notes that the author “starts off by comparing kindergarten schools” followed by showcasing Ontario’s school system, and then finally shifting to a comparison of areas that don’t have full-day programs. For each claim identified, the response offers a further detailed explanation of the line of reasoning with phrases such as the author “then led us to look at the middle and upper class students,” “he then connected it [the report] to the complaint,” and “To further prove his point, Gillis explained that those who did not benefit.” The incorporation of sequencing language (“Gillis starts off by comparing” and “[t]o begin with”) does not negate how the response articulates the author’s claims and how those claims relate to one another. Because the response provides a thorough evaluation of the author’s line of reasoning while accurately identifying the relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among the claims, it earned 6 points.

End-of-Course Exam
Part A: Short Answer

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **6** points because it provides a detailed evaluation of the evidence and sources used to support the author's main argument. The response discusses the credibility of the sources while also analyzing the relevance of specific pieces of evidence from those sources. For instance, the response evaluates a report in which “the Ontario government claimed to have a study proving the effectiveness of their full-day kindergarten,” noting that the study indicated the program’s success at “better preparing a student for 1st grade.” The response goes on to note how “educator minister Liz Sandals and Charles Pascal” praised the study and describing it “as ‘nothing short of incredible’ or ‘it shows the program is truly a life-changer.’” Showcasing a nuance in evaluation, the response also argues the report lacks credibility, claiming that “these people were not good sources as they had supported the full-day education program before this study was released.” The response also states how a specific study “conducted by McMaster University economist Philip Decicca” on California’s school system helped “further prove the point that full-day education would be negative for a multitude of environments,” highlighting the relevance of the “primary source of evidence” for the argument. In a final statement on how the author supports his argument, the response concludes with a statement that the author “showed that after further thinking, this [full-day kindergarten] might not be the wisest move.” Overall, because the response showcases the effectiveness of various sources and pieces of evidence by highlighting the strengths and weaknesses in terms of both credibility and relevance, it earned 6 points.

End-of-Course Exam Part A: Short Answer

Sample: B

Score: 2

Score: 4

Score: 4

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **2** points because it accurately identifies part of the author’s argument: that full-day kindergarten 1) “is a poor use of tax money” since 2) “children are prevented from developing socially and emotionally because they are removed from their family’s care too soon.” The response does not clearly identify the other part of the author’s main idea 3) full-day kindergarten shows no advantage over a half-day program and should not be implemented. Because the response only accurately identifies part of the argument, the response earned a 2.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **4** points because it accurately identifies some of the claims (e.g., “most modern governments want more kindergartens, not less,” “it is a waste of tax money,” and “poor or disadvantaged children did derive short-term benefits.” Attempting to explain the line of reasoning, the response only acknowledges that the author “builds the context to the authors’ argument” in reference to the discussion of the “German Educator who opened the world’s first kindergarten, who frequently found himself at odds with suspicious government officials.” Subsequently, the response then shifts to only using sequential transitions such as “Next,” “Furthermore,” “Lastly,” while providing a minimum discussion of the line of reasoning. Due to the lack of a thorough and detailed explanation of the line of reasoning, the response earned 4 points.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **4** points because it provides a vague, superficial assessment of credibility of one source and the relevance of one specific piece of evidence. The response first identifies that “in every area, students improved their readiness for Grade 1 and accelerated their developments, nothing short of incredible,” followed by “to be clear some children appear to have done worse with [full-day kindergarten] ...” The response attempts to explain relevance by discussing the evidence as “very effective as it shows exactly what a full day of kindergarten is not doing, developing children to be better.” The response also evaluates credibility by discussing that “an economist talking about kindergarten is not credible.” Later, the response recognizes another example of weak credibility by explaining that “researchers are not named and no degrees or fields are listed.” The response does not effectively analyze relevance and only provides broad statements such as “The evidence is really effective as it connects and develops the argument.” Because it does not offer a detailed evaluation of both the credibility of the sources as well as the relevance of at least two pieces of evidence, the response earned 4 points.

**End-of-Course Exam
Part A: Short Answer**

Sample: C

Score: 1

Score: 2

Score: 2

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **1** point because it misidentifies the author’s argument. The response misstates the author’s argument by including an idea that is not provided in the source material, “that it is difficult to adapt and learn in an environment that you are unfamiliar with especially at a young age.” Because the response does not correctly identify any part of the argument, it could not earn higher than a 1.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **2** points because only one claim was accurately identified with no discussion of a line of reasoning. The response includes the claim that “being taken away from them [parents] at an age such as 3 or 4 for continuous hours is going to be extremely difficult and will most likely end up with the child having behavioral issues.” No other claims are identified; thus, there is also no analysis of a line of reasoning. Because the response only identifies one claim, it earned a score of 2 points.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **2** points because it makes reference to only one piece of evidence, “This aligns with complaints that full-day programs impede the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from familial care too early.” Because the response makes no evaluative statements of relevance or credibility, the response could not score higher than 2 points.